Submitted to *Operations Research*

Combining Spot and Futures Markets: A Hybrid Market Approach to Dynamic Spectrum Access

Lin Gao, Jianwei Huang
Department of Information Engineering, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, {lgao, jwhuang}@ie.cuhk.edu.hk

Ying-Ju Chen
Department of Industrial Engineering and Operations Research, University of California, Berkeley, chen@ieor.berkeley.edu

Biying Shou
Department of Management Sciences, City University of Hong Kong, biying.shou@cityu.edu.hk

arXiv:1405.7175v2 [cs.NI] 13 Jun 2014

Dynamic spectrum access (DSA) is a new paradigm of secondary spectrum utilization and sharing. It allows unlicensed secondary users (SUs) to exploit the under-utilized radio spectrum licensed to primary users opportunistically. Market mechanism is a widely-used promising means to regulate the consuming behaviours of users and, hence, achieve the efficient allocation and consumption of limited resources. In this paper, we propose and study a *hybrid* secondary spectrum market consisting of both the *futures market* and the *spot market*, in which SUs (buyers) purchase under-utilized licensed spectrum from a primary spectrum regulator (PR), either through predefined contracts via the futures market, or through spot transactions via the spot market. We focus on the optimal spectrum allocation among SUs in an exogenous hybrid market that maximizes the secondary spectrum utilization efficiency. The problem is challenging due to the stochasticity and asymmetry of network information. To solve this problem, we first derive an off-line optimal allocation policy that maximizes the ex-ante expected spectrum utilization efficiency based on the stochastic distribution of network information. We then propose an on-line VCG auction that determines the real-time allocation and pricing of every spectrum based on the realized network information and the derived allocation policy. We further show that with the spatial frequency reuse, the proposed VCG auction is NP-hard; hence, it is not suitable for on-line implementation, especially in a large-scale market. To this end, we propose a heuristics approach based on an on-line VCG-like mechanism with polynomial-time complexity, and further characterize the corresponding performance loss bound analytically. We finally provide extensive numerical results to evaluate the performance of the proposed solutions.

Key words: dynamic spectrum access; spatial reuse; spot market; futures market

1. Introduction

1.1. Background and Motivations

Radio electromagnetic spectrum is a limited resource for wireless communications, and is becoming more congested and scarce with the explosive development of wireless services and networks. Nonetheless, extensive studies (e.g., FCC (2002), McHenry et al. (2006)) have shown that many

spectrum bands are heavily *under-utilized* due to the significant variations in spectrum occupying time and space. This suggests that the traditional static licensing approach, i.e., granting exclusive spectrum usage right to a single commercial or government department over a long time and in a large area, is no longer efficient or suitable for future wireless networks. Dynamic spectrum access (DSA) has been recently recognized as a novel and promising approach to increase spectrum utilization efficiency and alleviate spectrum scarcity. The key idea is to enable unlicensed secondary users (SUs) to exploit the under-utilized radio spectrum licensed to primary users (PUs) in an opportunistic manner (see Akyildiz et al. (2006), Buddhikot (2007), Haykin (2005), Zhao & Sadler (2007)).[1] The long-term success of DSA requires many innovations in technology, economics, and policy. In particular, it is essential to design a secondary spectrum sharing mechanism that achieves a high secondary spectrum utilization efficiency, and meanwhile offers necessary incentives for PUs to open their licensed spectrum for secondary sharing and unlicensed access.[2]

Market mechanism is a widely-used promising means to regulate and coordinate the consuming behaviours of users and, hence, achieve the efficient allocation and consumption of limited resource. Therefore, market-driven secondary spectrum trading is a natural choice to achieve the efficient spectrum utilization, and also a promising approach to address the incentive issue (see Hossain et al. (2009), Tonmukayakul & Weiss (2009)). With secondary spectrum trading, SUs temporarily *purchase* the under-utilized licensed spectrum from a primary spectrum regulator (PR), such as FCC in the U.S. and Ofcom in the UK, before using these licensed spectrum.[3] The secondary spectrum market differs from conventional markets (e.g., paintings, bonds, and electricity markets) in the following two aspects. First, *radio spectrum is spatially reusable.* That is, a spectrum can be potentially used by multiple SUs simultaneously, as long as these SUs do not generate mutual interferences (see Section 3.4 for details). Second, *the availability of spectrum is not deterministic.* To protect the subscribed PUs' benefits, a spectrum is only available to SUs when it is not occupied by any PU (i.e., when it is *idle*). Due to the stochastic nature of PUs' activities, the spectrum availability is often a random variable (see Section 3.1 for details). Based on the above two facts,

[1] This idea has been embraced by many government spectrum regulatory bodies (e.g., FCC in the U.S. and Ofcom in the UK), standardization organizations (e.g., IEEE and ECC), and major industry players (e.g., Google, Microsoft, Motorola, and Huawei). The most recent progress along this frontier is the finalization of the IEEE 802.22 Wireless Regional Area Network standard (see IEEE 802.22 (2011)) on the opening and secondary utilization of under-utilized spectrum in the UHF band (between around 500MHz and 800MHz) licensed for broadcast TV.

[2] For example, when FCC in the U.S. decided to open up the TV band for secondary unlicensed access, the National Association of the Broadcasters and Association for Maximum Service Television sued the FCC as they do not have incentives for such spectrum sharing (see NAB/MSTV Suit (2009)).

[3] A real-world secondary spectrum sharing example (that involves the interactions of spectrum regulators and unlicensed SUs) is the TV white space network (see FCC (2010)). In a TV white space network, SUs request and exploit the under-utilized UHF/VHF radio spectrum licensed for broadcast television service (called TV white space) from national spectrum regulators (e.g., FCC in the U.S.), usually via a third-party white space database.



Figure 1 Illustration of a time-slotted secondary spectrum market. The SUs not connected by an edge are interference-free, and can use the same (idle) spectrum at the same time without mutual interference. For example, the idle (green) spectrum at time $t = 7$ is allocated to SUs {2, 6, 8} simultaneously.

the mechanism design in such a secondary spectrum market needs to overcome a different set of challenges than in a conventional market.

1.2. Market Model and Problem Formulation

In this paper, we consider the secondary spectrum trading between one PR (seller) and multiple SUs (buyers) for all idle spectrum in a given time period (consisting of multiple time slots). Moreover, we consider the *short-term* spectrum trading, i.e., the idle spectrum is traded on a slot-by-slot basis. Fig. 1 illustrates such a time-slotted secondary spectrum market within a period of 12 time slots. The blank and shadowed squares denote the idle spectrum and busy spectrum in each time slot, respectively. The edge connecting two SUs denotes the interference relationship between them. In other words, any two SUs without a connecting edge (e.g., SUs {4, 5} or SUs {6, 8}) are interference-free (also called *independent*), and thus can use the same (idle) spectrum concurrently without any mutual interference. In this example, the idle spectrum at time $t = 7$ is allocated to SUs {2, 6, 8} simultaneously, as these SUs are independent of each other.

More specifically, we consider a *hybrid* secondary spectrum market consisting of both the *futures market* and the *spot market*. In our model, SUs can purchase spectrum either through predefined futures contracts via the futures market, or through spot transactions via the spot market. In the futures market, each SU reaches an agreement, called a futures contract or guaranteed contract, directly with the PR. The contract specifies not only the SU's demand and payment in a given period, but also the PR's penalty if violating the contract.[4] In the spot market, SUs buy spectrum in a real-time and on-demand manner through spot transactions, and multiple SUs may compete with each other for limited spectrum resource (e.g., through an auction). In the example of Fig. 1, we denote the contract users (blue) by 1, 2, 3, and 4, each requesting a pre-specific number of spectrum.

[4] In this sense, the futures market in this paper can be seen as a generalized version of those in stock markets (see Kolb & Overdahl (2007)). In futures stock markets, the seller is obligated to deliver the commodities at an explicit future date; whereas, in our market model, the seller is allowed to deliver the commodities at any time before the due date, and even to violate the contract with certain penalty.

Likewise, we denote the spot market users (red) by 5, 6, 7, and 8, each requesting and competing for spectrum in an on-demand manner. Note that the futures market insures buyers (sellers) against uncertainties of future supply (demand) through predefined contracts, while the spot market allows buyers to compete for limited resource based on their real-time demands and preferences.[5] Therefore, a hybrid market has both the reliability of futures market and the flexibility of spot market; hence, it is highly desirable for Quality of Service (QoS) differentiations in secondary spectrum utilization. Specifically, an SU with elastic traffic (e.g., file transferring or FTP downloading) may be more interested in spot transactions to achieve a flexible resource-price tradeoff; whereas, an SU with inelastic traffic requiring minimum data rates (e.g., Netflix video streaming or VoIP) may prefer the certainty of contracts in the futures market.

We focus on the optimal spectrum allocation in an *exogenous* hybrid market with given contract users (in the futures market) and given spot transaction users (in the spot market). That is, we want to answer the question: how to optimally allocate spectrum among the given contract users and spot market users to maximize the secondary spectrum utilization efficiency. Here, the secondary spectrum utilization efficiency (also called *spectrum efficiency*) is defined as the total social welfare generated by all SUs from utilizing all idle spectrum in the whole period of interest (see Section 3.5 for the detailed definition). Note that we assume an exogenous and quasi-static model set-up, i.e., both the network topology and the market structure are exogenously given, and remain unchanged in the whole time period.[6] The key problem is therefore to determine the optimal allocation of every idle spectrum among the given contract users and spot market users.[7]

This problem is challenging due to the *stochasticity* and *asymmetry* of network information. Here, network information mainly refers to the benefit (utility) of each SU from using each (idle) spectrum in each time slot. Stochasticity means that no one can observe the network information in the future, as the network changes randomly over time. Asymmetry means that the currently realized information of an SU is the private information, and cannot be observed by other entities, such as the PR and other SUs. Nevertheless, in the hybrid spectrum market, the allocation of spectrum in the whole time period must be jointly optimized due to the time-coupling constraint

[5] Guaranteed contract has been widely adopted by wireless service providers for different kinds of services, e.g., monthly subscription of data traffic (e.g., $25 for 2G wireless iPad data) or voice traffic (e.g., $35 for 180 minutes of voice communication in Hong Kong). On the other hand, with the explosive development of technological innovations, especially the emergence of DSA and cognitive radio, spot transaction, e.g., auction (see Gandhi et al. (2007), Huang et al. (2006), Li et al. (2008), Zhou et al. (2008), Zhou & Zheng (2009), and Wang et al. (2010)), has grown in prominence in secondary spectrum markets.

[6] Here the network topology regards the interference relationships among all SUs, and the market structure regards the SUs in each market and the contract of each SU in the futures market.

[7] Namely, we do not consider the endogenous market formulation and evolution in this work. In a more general case, we can consider the problem of an endogenous hybrid spectrum market structure, in which an SU can choose which market(s) to join, and what contract to accept if he or she is in the futures market. Our study in this paper provides important insights into the exogenous market with fixed user-market associations, and serves as an important first step for understanding the endogenous market.

Table 1 Key results in this paper

Problem	Solution	Performance	Complexity	Section No.
E-SEM: Expected Spectrum Efficiency Maximization	Policy + VCG	Optimal	Exponential	5, 6
	Policy + VCG-like	Sub-optimal	Polynomial	5, 6, 7

on the contract user demand (e.g., each contract user requires a specific number of spectrum in the whole period). This implies that solving the optimal spectrum allocation problem directly would require the complete network information in all time slots. As mentioned above, however, in practice the PR only has partial knowledge (e.g., the stochastic distribution) about the future network information due to the stochasticity of information. Moreover, it cannot observe all of the realized current network information, especially the private information of SUs, due to the asymmetry of information. Therefore, the key research problem becomes the following:

Problem 1 *How should the PR optimally allocate the idle spectrum in the given period among the contract users and spot market users to maximize the spectrum efficiency, taking into consideration the spatial spectrum reuse, information stochasticity, and information asymmetry?*

1.3. Solutions and Contributions

To solve this problem, we first derive an *off-line optimal policy* that maximizes the ex-ante expected spectrum efficiency based on the stochastic distribution of network information. We then design an *on-line VCG auction* that elicits SUs' private information realized in every time slot. Based on the elicited network information and the derived allocation policy, the VCG auction determines the real-time allocation and pricing of every spectrum. Such a solution technique (i.e., off-line policy and on-line auction) allows us to optimally allocate every spectrum in an on-line manner under stochastic and asymmetric information. We further show that with the spatial spectrum reuse, the proposed VCG auction relies on solving the maximum weight independent set (MWIS) problem, which is well-known to be NP-hard. Thus, it is not suitable for on-line implementation, especially in a large-scale market. This motivates us to further study low-complexity sub-optimal solutions. To this end, we propose a heuristics approach based on an on-line VCG-like mechanism with polynomial-time complexity, and further characterize the corresponding performance loss bound analytically. Our numerical results indicate that the heuristics approach exhibits good and robust performance (e.g., reaches at least 70% of the optimal efficiency in our simulations).

In summary, we list the key results and the corresponding section numbers in Table 1. It is important to note that the main contribution of this work is not the development of new auction theory, but rather the formulation of the hybrid spectrum market and the solution techniques (including the use of auction theory) to optimize the spectrum utilization in a given hybrid market. Specifically, the main contributions of this paper are as follows:

- *New modeling and solution technique*: We propose and study a hybrid spectrum market, which has both the reliability of futures market and the flexibility of spot market. Hence, it is highly desirable for QoS differentiations in secondary spectrum utilization. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first paper to study such a hybrid spectrum market with spatial spectrum reuse.
- *Optimal solution under stochastic and asymmetric information*: We analyze the optimal spectrum allocation in an exogenous hybrid market under stochastic and asymmetric network information systematically. Our proposed solution consists of two parts: (i) an off-line allocation policy that maximizes the ex-ante expected spectrum efficiency based on the stochastic network information; and (ii) an on-line VCG auction that determines the real-time allocation of every (idle) spectrum based on the realized network information and the pre-derived policy. Such a solution technique allows us to optimally allocate every spectrum in an on-line manner.
- *Heuristic solution with polynomial-time complexity*: We propose a heuristic approach based on an on-line VCG-like mechanism with polynomial-time complexity, and further characterize the corresponding performance loss bound analytically. This polynomial-time solution is particularly useful for achieving the efficient spectrum utilization in a large-scale network.
- *Performance evaluation*: We provide extensive numerical results to evaluate the performance of the proposed solutions. Our numerical results show that: (i) the proposed optimal allocation significantly outperforms the traditional greedy allocations, e.g., with an average increase of 20% in terms of the expected spectrum efficiency; and (ii) the proposed heuristics approach exhibits good and robust performance, e.g., reaches at least 70% of the optimal efficiency in our simulations.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. After reviewing the literature in Section 2, we describe the system model in Section 3, and present the problem formulation in Section 4. Then we derive the off-line optimal policy in Section 5, and design the on-line VCG mechanisms in Section 6. In Section 7, we analyze the performance loss in the low-complexity heuristic solution. in Section 8, we provide the detailed simulation results. We finally conclude in Section 9.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Secondary Spectrum Trading for DSA

A major motivation of this work is to establish economic incentives and improve spectrum utilization efficiency in dynamic spectrum access (DSA) and cognitive radio networks (CRNs). There are several comprehensive surveys on the technical aspects of DSA and CRNs (see Akyildiz et al. (2006), Buddhikot (2007), Haykin (2005), Zhao & Sadler (2007)).

2.1.1. Secondary Spectrum Trading in Pure Spectrum Markets. Recent years have witnessed a growing body of literature on the economic analysis (in particular the incentive issues) of DSA (see, e.g., Hossain et al. (2009), Tonmukayakul & Weiss (2009)). Market-driven *secondary spectrum trading* is a promising paradigm to address the incentive issue and achieve high spectrum

efficiency in DSA. The literature on secondary spectrum trading often considers *Pricing*, *Contract*, and *Auction*. Pricing and Contract are generally adopted by the *futures market*, wherein sellers and buyers enter into certain agreements, specifying the price, quality and demand in advance. In particular, Pricing is often used under information symmetry, where sellers and buyers possess the same market information (e.g., utility and quality) or hold the same degree of uncertainty about the market information (see, e.g., Kloeck et al. (2005), Niyato & Hossain (2008), Wang et al. (2008)). Contract has been widely used in supply chain models, with a main focus on the supply chain coordination (see de Kok & Graves (2003) for a comprehensive survey). Contract is effective in a market under information asymmetry, where sellers and buyers possess different information. The seller (or buyer) can offer a selling (purchasing) contract to extract the buyer surplus (seller surplus) as much as possible (see, e.g., Duan et al. (2011), Gao et al. (2010), Kalathil & Jain (2010)). In contrast to Pricing and Contracts, Auctions are one of the most common mechanisms used by the *spot market*, wherein buyers compete to obtain commodities by offering different bids. Auctions are particularly suitable for the information asymmetry scenario. With a well-designed auction, buyers (bidders) have the incentive to bid for the resource in a truthful manner, and the seller can allocate the resource efficiently without knowing the buyers' private information in advance (see, e.g., Gandhi et al. (2007), Huang et al. (2006), Li et al. (2008), Wang et al. (2010), Zhou et al. (2008), Zhou & Zheng (2009)).

However, the above work considers the secondary spectrum trading in a pure spectrum market (i.e., either spot or futures market). Instead, our setup incorporates the short-term secondary spectrum trading in a *hybrid* spectrum market.

2.1.2. Secondary Spectrum Trading in Hybrid Spectrum Markets Kasbekar et al. (2010) and Muthusamy et al. (2011) considered the secondary spectrum trading in a hybrid market. In their settings, primary sellers offer two types of contracts: the guaranteed-bandwidth contract and the opportunistic-access contract. The main difference between these two prior papers and our paper lies in the formulation of the guaranteed contract. Specifically, in Kasbekar et al. (2010) and Muthusamy et al. (2011), the guaranteed-bandwidth contract provides guaranteed access to a certain amount of bandwidth at *every* time slot. In our model, the guaranteed-delivery contract provides guaranteed access to a total amount of bandwidth in one time period; nevertheless, the bandwidth delivery at every time slot can be different, depending on the PUs' own demand. The main advantage of our approach is its flexibility in shifting secondary demand across time slots (to comply with the PUs' random demand). That is, it enables opportunistic delivery of a small (or large) bandwidth to SUs in those time slots that the PUs' own demand is high (or low). Additionally, our model is also more practically relevant to a wide range of applications, which do not require fixed data delivery per time slot, but demand a guaranteed average data rate over

Table 2 A summary of secondary spectrum trading literature

Market Type	Related Work
Futures Market	Pricing: Kloeck et al. (2005), Niyato & Hossain (2008), Wang et al. (2008). Contract: Duan et al. (2011), Gao et al. (2010), Kalathil & Jain (2010).
Spot Market	Auction: Gandhi et al. (2007), Huang et al. (2006), Li et al. (2008), Wang et al. (2010), Zhou et al. (2008), Zhou & Zheng (2009).
Hybrid Market	Abhishek et al. (2012), Gao et al. (2012a), Kasbekar et al. (2010), Muthusamy et al. (2011)

each time period. Furthermore, the underlying market models are also different. Kasbekar et al. (2010) and Muthusamy et al. (2011) assumed that the demand (supply) markets have infinite liquidity. That is, any bandwidth amount supplied by the seller can be sold out (any bandwidth amount demanded by the buyer can be bought from the market) at an "outside fixed price". In this sense, their market models are closely related to the ideal competitive market. We assume that the market price is endogenously determined by the associated seller and buyer (through, for example, an VCG mechanism). Thus, we essentially consider the monopoly market.

Abhishek et al. (2012) also considered a hybrid market, in which a cloud service provider sells its service to users via two different pricing schemes: pay-as-you-go (PAYG) and spot pricing. Under the PAYG, users are charged a fixed price per unit time. Under the spot pricing, users compete for services via using an auction. They focused on the optimal market formulation, that is, the service provider selects different PAYG prices such that different users will choose different pricing schemes or market types; consequently, different hybrid markets will be formulated. In our work, we focused on the optimal spectrum allocation in a *given* hybrid market. In other words, each SU is associated and fixed in a particular market (based on his or her application type), and the PR determines the optimal spectrum allocation among the given contract users and spot market users.

In Gao et al. (2012a), we studied the secondary spectrum trading in the same hybrid market. However, Gao et al. (2012a) did not consider spatial spectrum reuse, which is the key contribution of this paper. With spatial spectrum reuse, the same spectrum can be potentially used by multiple SUs simultaneously; thus, the total spectrum efficiency can be greatly improved. This new coupling in the spatial dimension creates many challenges (e.g., solving MWIS problems) in the optimal mechanism design, and makes the problem significantly different from those without spatial spectrum reuse. Precise mathematical modeling and understanding of the spatial coupling are often lacking in the wireless literature. One of the main contributions of this paper is to propose a low-complexity heuristic algorithm to tackle this issue, and to quantify the performance bound of the proposed algorithm. For convenience, we summarize the key literature in Table 2.

2.2. Dual Sourcing in Supply Chain Management

The theoretic model used in our work is related to the *dual sourcing* problem in supply chain management. Specifically, with dual sourcing, a firm can procure a single commodity from a supplier

via a long-term contract and/or from a spot market via short-term purchases (see Kleindorfer & Wu (2003)). In such a context, the long-term contract and short-term purchase in the supply chain model corresponds to the guaranteed contract and spot transaction in our model, respectively. Note that the firm in the supply chain model buys commodities through dual sourcing, while the PR in our model sells commodities through guaranteed contracts and spot transactions. The long-term/guaranteed contract ensures consistent over time availability of commodities with guaranteed quality at a predetermined price; whereas, the short-term purchase/spot transaction provides high inventory flexibility, allowing firms to buy and sell commodities at any quantity with zero lead time, but at a random market price. The main advantage of dual sourcing is to hedge the future uncertainties in the supplier's commodity supply and the end users' demand, so as to hedgy the financial risk in the supply chain (see Kleindorfer (2008a,b)).

The integration of long-term contracts and short-term purchases is of particular interest to the firm in a supply chain, due to the following two reasons: (i) sourcing competition can keep purchasing prices under control by the firm; and (ii) a wider supply base can mitigate the risk induced by the uncertainty at one supplier. Lee & Whang (2002) were the first to integrate, after sales, the spot market considerations within a newsvendor ordering framework. Peleg et al. (2002) studied the long-term and short-term integrated sourcing using a stylized two period model. Yi & Scheller-Wolf (2003) studied the nature of the optimal inventory policy when such a dual sourcing is used, in the presence of a fixed cost for the spot market participation. Wu & Kleindorfer (2005) proposed a general framework with integrated long-term and short-term contract decisions for non-storable commodities. Kouvelis et al. (2009) studied the problem of dual sourcing with financial hedging for storable commodities.

Our work differs from the above work in the following aspects. First, the spectrum in our model can be potentially used by multiple SUs simultaneously, while a traditional commodity can usually be used by one user only. Second, the availability of spectrum is stochastic, while the availability of a traditional commodity is usually deterministic. Third, we focus on the spectrum utilization efficiency maximization, rather than the financial risk hedging. Fourth, instead of designing the optimal contracts, we treat contracts as exogenously given, and focus on the problem of how to fulfill these contracts and cope with additional demand from spot markets. Finally, we consider stochastic and asymmetric network information.

3. System Model

3.1. System Description

We consider a dynamic spectrum access (DSA) system with one primary spectrum regulator (PR) and multiple secondary users (SUs) The PR has the authority to grant the secondary utilization of certain licensed frequency band, which is divided into K orthogonal *channels* using channelization

methods, such as frequency division and code division. In Fig. 1, for example, we have $K = 3$. The licensed frequency band is licensed to a set of subscribed licensed holders (also called primary users, PUs). PUs access channels with the slotted transmission protocol widely-used in today's wireless communication systems (e.g., GSM, WCDMA, and LTE). That is, the total time is divided into fixed-time intervals, called *time slots*, and each PU transmits over one or multiple channel(s) according to a synchronous time slot structure. Depending on the activities of PUs, some channels may be not used by any PU (i.e., idle) in some time slots, which can be potentially assigned for the secondary utilization of SUs.

We consider the *market-driven* dynamic spectrum access, also called secondary spectrum trading, in which SUs temporarily purchase the idle channels from the PR. More specifically, we consider the *short-term* secondary spectrum trading, in which the idle channel is traded on a slot-by-slot basis. Namely, the basic resource unit for trading is "a particular channel at a particular time slot", referred to as a spectrum opportunity or *spectrum*. The main motivation for considering the *short-term* spectrum trading is as follows. The spectrum availability changes frequently and randomly over time due to the stochasticity of PUs' activities; thus, a channel that is idle in a particular time slot may not always be idle in the future.

Let CH_{kt} denote the spectrum on the k-th channel at time slot t. Let $\xi_{kt} \in \{0, 1\}$ denote the state (availability) of spectrum CH_{kt}, with $\xi_{kt} = 1$ indicating that the spectrum is not used by any PU and thus is available for SUs, and $\xi_{kt} = 0$ otherwise. The amount of spectrums in a given period (say T time slots) is referred to as the PR's **spectrum supply**, denoted by $\mathcal{Q} \triangleq \{\text{CH}_{kt}\}_{k\in\{1,\ldots,K\},t\in\{1,\ldots,T\}}$. The size of total supply is denoted by $S = |\mathcal{Q}| \triangleq K \cdot T$. The states of all spectrums in $\mathcal{Q}$ are referred to as the **spectrum availability**, denoted by $\mathcal{X} \triangleq \{\xi_{kt}\}_{k\in\{1,\ldots,K\},t\in\{1,\ldots,T\}}$.

Due to the uncertainty of PUs' activities, the spectrum availability changes randomly across both time and frequency. Fig. 1 illustrates an example of such a system, where $K = 3$, $T = 12$, and $S = 36$. At the time slot $t = 1$, the spectrum CH_{21} is idle, while the spectrum CH_{11} and CH_{31} are busy, i.e., $\xi_{21} = 1$ and $\xi_{11} = \xi_{31} = 0$.

Following are our assumptions on the spectrum availability and spectrum usage.

ASSUMPTION 1. *The spectrum availability is independently and identically distributed (i.i.d.) across time and frequency.*[8]

ASSUMPTION 2. *Each SU can transmit over multiple channels simultaneously.*[9]

[8] We will show in our technical report, Gao et al. (2012b), that our results can be generalized to the non-i.i.d. spectrum availability case with minor modifications.

[9] This is supported by most physical layer access technologies (e.g., OFDMA) even with just one transmitter antenna per SU, and is possible with other technologies when each SU has multiple transceivers.

Let random variable $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ denote the spectrum availability. Let ρ_{kt} and $1-\rho_{kt}$ denote the idle probability and busy probability of spectrum CH_{kt}, respectively. That is, $f_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(\xi_{kt})=\rho_{kt}$ if $\xi_{kt}=1$, $f_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(\xi_{kt})=1-\rho_{kt}$ if $\xi_{kt}=0$, and $f_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(\xi_{kt})=0$ for any $\xi_{kt}\notin\{0,1\}$, where $f_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(\cdot)$ is the probability mass function of $\boldsymbol{\xi}$.[10] Based on the i.i.d. assumption, we have $\rho_{kt}=\rho$, $\forall k,t$.

3.2. Futures Market and Spot Market

Wireless applications can be broadly categorized as either *elastic* or *inelastic* depending on Quality-of-Service (QoS) requirements.[11] With elastic traffic, SUs have elastic demands for spectrum, in the sense that the tasks are not urgent in terms of time; thus, the QoS will not be significantly affected, even if the spectrum resource is limited and the transmission rate is low for a substantial amount of time. With inelastic traffic, SUs have inelastic demands for spectrum. In other words, the tasks can only function well when the data rate is guaranteed to be above certain thresholds such that the delay requirements are met; otherwise they will suffer significant performance loss. It is important to note that the information of the application type is usually explicitly represented in the headers of data packets, and can be easily extracted by the network operator through deep packet inspection. Hence, it is reasonable to assume that an SU cannot fake his or her application type arbitrarily. Examples of elastic traffic include FTP downloading, data backup, and cloud synchronization, and examples of inelastic traffic include VoIP, video streaming, and real-time data collection.

To accommodate the various requirements of elastic traffic and inelastic traffic (so as to achieve desirable QoS differentiations), we propose a *hybrid spectrum market* combining both the futures market and the spot market. Next we define the futures market and spot market formally.

Futures Market. In the futures market, each SU enters into an agreement, called a futures contract or *guaranteed contract*, directly with the PR. The contract specifies the key elements in trading, e.g., the SU's total demand and payment in the given period. Once the PR accepts a contract, it is committed to deliver the specified number of spectrum to the SU. If the PR fails to do so, it needs to pay certain *penalty* for compensating the SU's potential welfare loss. This penalty can be a unit price paid for every undelivered spectrum (called a soft contract) or simply a total payment for the violation of contract (called a hard contract).

Spot Market. In the spot market, each SU purchases spectrums in a real-time and on-demand manner through spot transactions. That is, an SU initiates a purchasing request only when he or she needs spectrum, and multiple SUs requesting the same spectrum would compete with each

[10] We will use $f_{\boldsymbol{X}}(\cdot)$ and $F_{\boldsymbol{X}}(\cdot)$ to denote the probability distribution function (PDF) and cumulative distribution function (CDF) of a continuous random variable or vector $\boldsymbol{X}$. For notational convenience, we use the same notation $f_{\boldsymbol{X}}(\cdot)$ and $F_{\boldsymbol{X}}(\cdot)$ to denote the probability mass function and CDF of a discrete random variable $\boldsymbol{X}$.

[11] Note the meaning of "elastic/inelastic demand" in wireless networks (in this paper) is a bit different from that in microeconomics, where it is mainly used to characterize whether a consumer's demand changes with the market price. In wireless networks, however, it is mainly used to characterize an SU's inherent demand for spectrums.

other for the spectrum, e.g., through an auction. The spectrum is delivered immediately to the winner at a real-time market price, which depends on both the SUs' preferences and competitions. The winner's payment is also dependent on the SUs' preferences and competitions.

Although, in practice, it is more desirable to allow SUs to have the flexibility to choose which market to join, in this work we assume that *the SUs with inelastic traffic always choose the futures market, and the SUs with elastic traffic always choose the spot market.*[12] In other words, we will leave out the SU's market selection problem, and instead focus exclusively on the spectrum allocation in the given hybrid markets. This setup helps us to concentrate on the technical challenges brought by the spatial spectrum reuse and the information stochasticity & asymmetry.

Next we provide the key assumptions on the hybrid market structure.

ASSUMPTION 3. *We assume that the hybrid spectrum market is exogenously given.*[13]

ASSUMPTION 4. *We assume that each SU has one application, and all SUs with inelastic traffic (elastic traffic) are in the futures market (spot market).*[14]

Based on these assumptions, we can divide SUs into two disjoint sets, each associated with one market. Let $\mathcal{N} \triangleq \{1, 2, ..., N\}$ and $\mathcal{M} \triangleq \{1, 2, ..., M\}$ denote the sets of SUs in the futures market and the spot market, respectively. For convenience, we will use the notation "n" to denote a contract user, and "m" to denote a spot market user. When needed, we will use the superscripts "C" and "S" to indicate variables related to the futures market and spot market, respectively.

3.3. Futures Contract Definition

A contract could be quite complicated, depending on specific requirements of a contract user's application. In this work, we focus on a basic contract form, which consists of two parts: (i) the SU's demand and payment for spectrum in each period; and (ii) the PR's penalty when not delivering the demanded spectrums to the SU. Formally, we write the contract of an SU $n \in \mathcal{N}$ as:

$$\text{CTR}_n \triangleq \left\{B_n, D_n, \boldsymbol{J}_n\right\}, \tag{1}$$

where B_n is the SU's payment, D_n is the SU's demand in one period, and $\boldsymbol{J}_n = (J_n, \{\widehat{P}_n, \widehat{B}_n\})$ is the PR's penalty scheme. Here, $J_n \in \{0, 1\}$ indicates the contract type (soft or hard), $\widehat{P}_n$ is the unit penalty for a soft contract ($J_n = 0$), and $\widehat{B}_n$ is the total penalty for a hard contract ($J_n = 1$). Thus,

[12] As mentioned previously, one key motivation for this assumption is that SUs cannot fake their applications arbitrarily. In our technical report, Gao et al. (2012b), we will further show that even if an SU has the capability of faking his or her application type, he or she does not have the incentive to do so, if the hybrid market is properly designed.

[13] This means that the user-market association is fixed, and the contract of each futures market user is also fixed during the whole period of interest.

[14] Note that the assumption can be easily generalized: For an SU having multiple applications with different QoS requirements, we can simply divide the SU into multiple virtual SUs, each associated with one application.

the **actual payment** of contract user n (denoted by R_n) depends on the number of spectrums he or she actually obtains (denoted by d_n), that is:

$$R_n = B_n - \mathbb{P}(d_n, D_n), \tag{2}$$

where $\mathbb{P}(d_n, D_n)$ is the PR's penalty if violating the contract, given by:

$$\mathbb{P}(d_n, D_n) \triangleq \begin{cases} [D_n - d_n]^+ \cdot \widehat{P}_n, & J_n = 0 \\ [[D_n - d_n]]^+ \cdot \widehat{B}_n, & J_n = 1 \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

where $[x]^+ = \max\{0, x\}$ and $[[x]]^+ = \max\{0, \frac{x}{|x|}\}$. That is, $[x]^+ = x$ and $[[x]]^+ = 1$, if $x > 0$.

For convenience, we denote the set of all contracts in the futures market by $\mathcal{B} \triangleq \{\text{CTR}_n\}_{n \in \mathcal{N}}$. The important assumptions on the guaranteed contract are listed below.

ASSUMPTION 5. *By (1)-(3), we assume that contract users do not care about which specific spectrums they will obtain in each period, but only the number of spectrums they will obtain. We refer to such a contract as the* ***guaranteed-delivery contract****.*

ASSUMPTION 6. *We further assume that contract users care about the expected number of spectrums they obtain, as will be shown by (16)-(17) in Section 4.*

The main practical motivation for such an assumption is that most wireless applications in practice require an expected/average data rate during a certain time period. For example, video streaming concerns the average downloading rate in every minute, and VoIP concerns the average downloading/uploading rate in every second. When the actual data rate is occasionally less than the average rate, various coding and error concealment technologies can be employed, so that the SUs will not feel significant performance degradation. Thus, with a proper choice of the length of allocation period (e.g., one minute for video streaming or one second for VoIP), such a contract with the expected demand is suitable for most wireless applications. In fact, with the uncertainties of spectrum availability and the stochasticity of SU utility on each spectrum, it is practically impossible to guarantee a strict spectrum supply for each contract user. To the best of our knowledge, no such guarantee has been provided even in the latest communication standard. To make our analysis more complete, we also provide detailed theoretical analysis and numerical evaluation for the impact of this assumption on the performance in our technical report, Gao et al. (2012b).

3.4. Spatial Spectrum Reuse

As mentioned previously, an important characteristic of a spectrum market is that radio spectrum is *spatially reusable* subject to certain spatial interference constraints (see Tse & Viswanath (2005)). For example, a spectrum can be used by multiple SUs simultaneously if they are far enough apart and do not interfere with each other. This leads to a fundamental difference between the spectrum market and conventional markets: the same spectrum can be potentially sold to multiple SUs.



Figure 2 Conflict graph representation.

In this work, we adopt a widely-used physical model to capture the interference relationships between SUs, namely, the *protocol interference model* (see Gupta & Kumar (2000)). Under the protocol interference model, multiple SUs can use the same spectrum simultaneously without mutual interference, if and only if none of the SUs falls inside the interference ranges of others (e.g., they are sufficiently far away from each other). The network under a protocol interference model can usually be represented by a *conflict graph*, with each vertex denoting an SU, and each edge indicating that two associated SUs fall inside the interference range of each other. Thus, any two SUs not connected by an edge (also called *independent*) can use the same spectrum simultaneously, while any two connecting SUs cannot.

Fig. 2 illustrates the conflict graph representation for a network with 6 SUs, in which each dash circle denotes the interference range of the associated SU. In this example, SUs 1 and 2 are located in the interference ranges of each other, while SUs 1 and 3 are not. Thus, SUs 1 and 3 are independent of each other (and therefore can use the same spectrum simultaneously), while SUs 1 and 2 are not. Fig. 1 also illustrates a similar conflict graph, where SUs 2, 6, and 8 are independent of each other, whereas SUs 1, 2, and 3 are not.

Let $\mathrm{G} \triangleq (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ denote the graph consisting of all SUs (and the associated edges, similarly hereafter), where $\mathcal{V} \triangleq \mathcal{M} \bigcup \mathcal{N}$ is the set of vertices (SUs), and $\mathcal{E} \triangleq \{\mathsf{e}_{ij} \mid i, j \in \mathcal{V}\}$ is the set of edges. Let $\mathrm{G}^{\mathrm{s}} \triangleq (\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{s}}, \mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{s}})$ denote the *spot market subgraph* consisting of all spot market users, and $\mathrm{G}^{\mathrm{c}} \triangleq (\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{c}}, \mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{c}})$ denote the *futures market subgraph* consisting of all contract users, that is, $\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{s}} \triangleq \mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{c}} \triangleq \mathcal{N}$, $\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{s}} \triangleq \{\mathsf{e}_{ij} \in \mathcal{E} \mid i, j \in \mathcal{M}\}$, and $\mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{c}} \triangleq \{\mathsf{e}_{ij} \in \mathcal{E} \mid i, j \in \mathcal{N}\}$. For presentation convenience, we further introduce the concept of side market.

Definition 1 (**Side Market**). The side market (subgraph) of a contract user set $\boldsymbol{n} \subseteq \mathcal{N}$, denoted by $\mathrm{G}^{\mathrm{s}}_{\boldsymbol{n}} = (\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{s}}_{\boldsymbol{n}}, \mathcal{E}^{\mathrm{s}}_{\boldsymbol{n}})$, is a subgraph of the spot market, consisting of all spot market users **except** the neighbors of contract users $\boldsymbol{n}$.

Here, the "neighbors" of $\boldsymbol{n}$ refer to spot market users connecting to at least one contract user in the set $\boldsymbol{n}$. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{s}}_{\boldsymbol{n}_1} \subseteq \mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{s}}_{\boldsymbol{n}_2} \subseteq \mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{s}}$ for any $\boldsymbol{n}_2 \subseteq \boldsymbol{n}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{N}$, since a neighbor of $\boldsymbol{n}_2$ must

be a neighbor of $\boldsymbol{n}_1$ if $\boldsymbol{n}_2 \subseteq \boldsymbol{n}_1$. In Fig. 1, we have $\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{C}} = \{1,2,3,4\}$, $\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{S}} = \{5,6,7,8\}$, and examples of side markets include $\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{S}}_{\{1\}} = \{6,7,8\}$ and $\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{S}}_{\{1,2,3\}} = \{7,8\}$. Obviously, $\mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{S}}_{\{1,2,3\}} \subseteq \mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{S}}_{\{1\}} \subseteq \mathcal{V}^{\mathrm{S}}$.

We further introduce some basic concepts in graph theory, which will be frequently used in our later discussions. The details can be referred to a standard textbook of graph theory, e.g., West (2001). An **independent set** of a graph is a subset of its vertices, such that *none* of two vertices in the subset are connected by an edge. On the contrary, a **clique** of a graph is a subset of its vertices, such that *every* two vertices in the subset are connected by an edge. A **maximum weight independent set** (MWIS) of a vertex-weighted graph, in which each vertex is associated with a number (weight), is the independent set with the maximum total weight. Let $\mathcal{I}(\mathrm{G})$ and $\mathcal{C}(\mathrm{G})$ denote the sets of all independent sets and all cliques of a graph G, respectively.

Based on the above concepts, the spatial interference constraint can be defined as follows.

Definition 2 (**Spatial Interference Constraint – SIC**). Any two SUs in a clique of G cannot use the same spectrum simultaneously; on the other hand, all SUs in an independent set of G can use the same spectrum simultaneously.

Finally, we list the key assumption on the network topology or graph G below.

Assumption 7. *We assume that the network topology* G *is exogenously given, and remains unchanged during the whole period of interest.*

This corresponds to a static or quasi-static network scenario, in which SUs do not move or move slowly. With this assumption, it is reasonable to assume that the network topology is public information to the PR.

3.5. Utility

The *utility* of an SU i over a spectrum CH_{kt} reflects the SU's preference for the transmission rate (capacity) achieved on spectrum CH_{kt}. Specifically, it is determined by two factors: (i) the transmission rate of SU i over spectrum CH_{kt} (denoted by $r_{i,kt}$), reflecting how efficiently SU i utilizes spectrum CH_{kt}; and (ii) the user preference of SU i (denoted by $\alpha_{i,kt}$), reflecting how eagerly SU i desires for spectrum CH_{kt}. To avoid confusion, we use notation $v_{m,kt}$ and $u_{n,kt}$ to denote the utilities of spot market user m and contract user n over spectrum CH_{kt}, respectively. Formally, we can write the utilities $v_{m,kt}$ and $u_{n,kt}$ as generic functions:

$$v_{m,kt} \triangleq g_m\big(r_{m,kt},\ \alpha_{m,kt}\big) \quad \text{and} \quad u_{n,kt} \triangleq g_n\big(r_{n,kt},\ \alpha_{n,kt}\big), \tag{4}$$

where $g_i(\cdot)$ is the generic utility function of SU i, which generally increases in both the transmission rate and the user preference. Typical examples of utility functions include: (a) linear functions, e.g., $g_i(r,\alpha) = \alpha \cdot r$; (b) sigmoid functions, e.g., $g_i(r,\alpha) = \alpha \cdot \frac{1}{1+e^{r_0 - r}}$; and (c) step functions, e.g., $g_i(r,\alpha) = \alpha$ if r exceeds a certain threshold r_0, and 0 otherwise.

The user preference $\alpha_{i,kt}$ is a *subjective* feeling of SU i for spectrum CH_{kt}, and is related to factors such as traffic state, urgency, and importance. The transmission rate $r_{i,kt}$ is an *objective* attribute of spectrum CH_{kt} for SU i, and is related to a spectrum-specific quality q_{kt} and a user-specific channel coefficient $h_{i,kt}$. The q_{kt} is common for all SUs, regarding factors such as channel bandwidth, noise level, and power constraint. The $h_{i,kt}$ is usually independent between different SUs, regarding factors such as path loss, shadow fading, and small scale fading (or multiple-path effect). Typically, $r_{i,kt}$ is given by the Shannon-Hartley theorem (see Shannon (2001)):

$$r_{i,kt} = B_k \cdot \log\left(1 + \frac{P_i \cdot |H_{i,kt}|^2}{\sigma_{kt}^2}\right), \tag{5}$$

where B_k is the channel bandwidth, P_i is the transmission power, σ_{kt}^2 is the noise level over spectrum CH_{kt} (captured by the common spectrum quality q_{kt}), and $|H_{i,kt}|^2$ is the channel gain of SU i over spectrum CH_{kt} (captured by the user-specific channel coefficient $h_{i,kt}$).

By (4) and (5), the SU's utility (over a spectrum) is essentially a joint function of the common spectrum quality, user-specific channel coefficient, and user preference. For notational convenience, we will write the utility as $v_{m,kt} \triangleq g_m\big(q_{kt}, h_{m,kt}, \alpha_{m,kt}\big)$ and $u_{n,kt} \triangleq g_n\big(q_{kt}, h_{n,kt}, \alpha_{n,kt}\big)$. In general, the spectrum quality, user-specific channel coefficient, and user preference change randomly across time and frequency. For simplicity, the following assumptions are used in our work.

Assumption 8. *The spectrum quality, user-specific channel coefficient (of every SU), and user-preference (of every SU) are all i.i.d. across time and channels.*

Based on the above assumption, we can see that *the utility of each SU is also i.i.d. across time and channels.*[15] Let random variable $\boldsymbol{q}$ denote the spectrum quality, $\boldsymbol{h}_i$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i$ denote the user-specific channel coefficient and preference of SU i. Let random variables $\boldsymbol{v}_m \triangleq g_m\big(\boldsymbol{q}, \boldsymbol{h}_m, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_m\big)$ and $\boldsymbol{u}_n \triangleq g_n\big(\boldsymbol{q}, \boldsymbol{h}_n, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_n\big)$ denote the utilities of spot market user m and contract user n, respectively. We can further see that the utilities of different SUs (over the same spectrum) are partially correlated by the common spectrum quality $\boldsymbol{q}$. That is, *the utility of each spectrum is partially correlated across users.* Such a utility formulation generalizes both the independent utility across users (by removing the uncertainty of $\boldsymbol{q}$) and the completely correlated utility across users (by removing the uncertainty of $\boldsymbol{h}_i$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i$, $\forall i$).

Let random vector $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \triangleq (\boldsymbol{v}_1, ..., \boldsymbol{v}_M; \boldsymbol{u}_1, ..., \boldsymbol{u}_N)$ denote the utilities (vector) of all SUs, and $\theta_{kt} \triangleq \big(v_{1,kt}, ..., v_{M,kt}; u_{1,kt}, ..., u_{N,kt}\big)$ denote a realization of $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$ on spectrum CH_{kt}. As will be shown later, in the spot market, the utility $v_{m,kt}$ reflects the SU m's maximum willingness-to-pay (or welfare) for the spectrum CH_{kt}. In the futures market, however, there is no explicit relationship between the

[15] Note that in practice, the SU's utility may not be i.i.d. across time and channels, due to the non-i.i.d. of spectrum quality, user-specific channel coefficient, and/or user preference. We will show in our technical report, Gao et al. (2012b), that our work can be easily applied to the scenario with non-i.i.d. utility across time or channels.

utility $u_{n,kt}$ and the SU n's payment (or welfare), which is pre-specified by the SU n's contract. Since each spectrum CH_{kt} is fully characterized by the utility vector θ_{kt} and its availability ξ_{kt}, we also refer to $\{\theta_{kt}, \xi_{kt}\}$ as the **information of spectrum ch**$_{kt}$. Formally,

DEFINITION 3 (**Network Information**). The information of each spectrum CH_{kt} consists of its availability and the utilities of all SUs over that spectrum, i.e., $\{\theta_{kt}, \xi_{kt}\}$. The information of all spectrums in $\mathcal{Q}$ is referred to as the network information, i.e., $\{\theta_{kt}, \xi_{kt}\}_{k\in\{1,\dots,K\},t\in\{1,\dots,T\}}$.

For convenience, we will refer to a spectrum with information $\{\theta_{kt}, \xi_{kt}\}$ as spectrum $\{\theta_{kt}, \xi_{kt}\}$.

3.6. Spectrum Efficiency

When the PR leases an idle spectrum of a PU to an SU for secondary utilization, the SU achieves a certain benefit, called *SU-surplus*, which equals the difference between the total *welfare* achieved from using these spectrums and the payment transferred to the related PU; the PU also achieves a certain benefit, called *PU-surplus*, which equals the difference between the payment from the SU and the cost of owning spectrum and sharing spectrum with unlicensed SUs.[16] The **social welfare** generated by such a process is the sum of the SU-surplus and the PU-surplus, which equals the difference between the welfare (SU) generated and the cost (PU) involved. That is:

$$\text{Social Welfare} = \text{SU Surplus} + \text{PU Surplus} = \text{SU Welfare} - \text{PU Cost}.$$

Notice that the PU's cost is a constant (sunk cost) independent of the secondary spectrum allocation. Without loss of generality, we normalize it to zero. As a result, the social welfare is equivalent to the welfare generated by the SU. Next we define the *welfare* of each SU formally.

Welfare of Spot Market User. In the spot market, based on the characteristics of elastic traffic, an SU achieves an immediate welfare from any spectrum allocated, and such a welfare is directly related to his or her utility of the spectrum. Thus, the total welfare of a spot market user m (denoted by w_m^{S}) can be defined as the total utility achieved: [17]

$$w_m^{\text{S}} = \sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{t=1}^{T} a_{m,kt}^{\text{S}} \cdot v_{m,kt} \cdot \xi_{kt}, \tag{6}$$

where $a_{m,kt}^{\text{S}} \in \{0,1\}$ indicates whether to allocate a spectrum CH_{kt} to SU m. The factor ξ_{kt} means that only the idle spectrums can be used by SUs.

Welfare of Contract User. In the futures market, however, an SU's welfare is *not* related to the utility that he or she achieves, but rather to the total number of spectrums that he or she obtains. Based on the requirement of inelastic traffic, the SU achieves a fixed total welfare if the

[16] Such a cost may include the spectrum license fee, management fee, maintenance fee, etc.

[17] Our method can be directly applied to a general case, in which the SU's welfare is a generic function of his utility. In that case, we have $w_m^{\text{S}} = \sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{t=1}^{T} a_{m,kt}^{\text{S}} \cdot y_m\big(v_{m,kt}\big) \cdot \xi_{kt}$, where $y_m(\cdot)$ is the welfare function of SU m.

number of allocated spectrums meets (or exceeds) the demand; otherwise the SU suffers certain welfare loss. Such a welfare definition coincides with the SU's actual payment defined in (2).[18] For convenience, we will use the notation $D_n^{\ddagger}$, $B_n^{\ddagger}$, $\widehat{P}_n^{\ddagger}$, and $\widehat{B}_n^{\ddagger}$ to denote the spectrum demand, the fixed total welfare, the unit welfare loss, and the fixed total welfare loss (when the demand is not satisfied), respectively. Since we do not address the problem of contract design in this work, we simply consider that each contract coincides perfectly with the contract user's welfare definition, i.e., $D_n^{\ddagger} = D_n$, $B_n^{\ddagger} = B_n$, $\widehat{P}_n^{\ddagger} = \widehat{P}_n$, and $\widehat{B}_n^{\ddagger} = \widehat{B}_n$. Thus, the total welfare of a contract user n (denoted by w_n^{C}) has exactly the same form as his actual payment in (2), that is:

$$w_n^{\text{C}} = B_n - \mathbb{P}(d_n, D_n) = B_n - \mathbb{P}\Big(\textstyle\sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{t=1}^{T} a_{n,kt}^{\text{C}} \cdot \xi_{kt},\ D_n\Big), \tag{7}$$

where $a_{n,kt}^{\text{C}} \in \{0,1\}$ indicates whether to allocate a spectrum CH_{kt} to SU n, $d_n \triangleq \sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{t=1}^{T} a_{n,kt}^{\text{C}} \cdot \xi_{kt}$ is the total number of *idle* spectrums allocated to the SU n, and $\mathbb{P}(d_n, D_n)$ is the potential welfare loss of the SU caused by the unmet demand, that is:

$$\mathbb{P}(d_n, D_n) = (1 - J_n) \cdot [D_n - d_n]^+ \cdot \widehat{P}_n + J_n \cdot [[D_n - d_n]]^+ \cdot \widehat{B}_n. \tag{8}$$

which has the same form as the PR's potential penalty defined in (3).

It is obvious that the contract user's welfare in (7) does *not* depend on the spectrum utilization (or utility). From a social perspective, however, it is important to consider both the contract user's personal welfare and the spectrum utilization. Thus, we define the total welfare generated by a contract user n, **from a social perspective**, as a weighted sum of the contract user's welfare w_n^{C} (personal) and a utilization-based welfare $\widetilde{w}_n^{\text{C}}$ (social), i.e., $\tau_n \cdot w_n^{\text{C}} + (1 - \tau_n) \cdot \widetilde{w}_n^{\text{C}}$, where

$$\widetilde{w}_n^{\text{C}} = \textstyle\sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{t=1}^{T} a_{n,kt}^{\text{C}} \cdot u_{n,kt} \cdot \xi_{kt} \tag{9}$$

is the total utility generated by contract user n, and $\tau_n \in [0,1]$ is the factor weighting w_n^{C} and $\widetilde{w}_n^{\text{C}}$. Such a welfare definition is flexible in capturing the social benefit from both the user's personal welfare and the social spectrum utilization.[19]

The spectrum secondary utilization efficiency (or *spectrum efficiency*), denoted by W, is defined as the total social welfare generated. Formally:

[18] It is worth noting that we are not contending that the contract user's actual payment in (2) or the contract details in (1) determines the user's welfare definition; on the contrary, the user's welfare determines the type of contract that he or she will accept and the payment that he or she is willing to pay.

[19] Such a contract user welfare formulation is also useful for guaranteeing QoS requirements of contract users. Specifically, if we define the welfare of a contract user as his or her personal welfare only, it is very likely that the spectrum with low quality (utility) will be allocated to the contract user; hence, the contract user's QoS requirement may not be guaranteed. This is because the personal welfare depends only on the number of the obtained spectrum, but not on the quality of the obtained spectrum. With our formulation, however, we can easily guarantee the QoS requirement of a contract user, for example, by defining a utility with negative infinity on the spectrum not satisfying his or her QoS requirement. Hence, our formulation provides the desirable flexibility to accommodate various scenarios of interest.

DEFINITION 4 (**Spectrum Efficiency**). The spectrum efficiency is the total social welfare generated by all SUs from their allocated spectrums, or equivalently, the total SUs' welfare:

$$W \triangleq \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_m^{\mathrm{S}} + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left(\tau_n \cdot w_n^{\mathrm{C}} + (1-\tau_n)\cdot \widetilde{w}_n^{\mathrm{C}}\right), \tag{10}$$

given any feasible spectrum allocation $\{a_{i,kt}\}_{i\in\mathcal{M}\bigcup\mathcal{N},k\in\{1,...,K\},t\in\{1,...,T\}}$.[20]

Based on the above, the spectrum efficiency maximization (SEM) problem can be defined as follows: finding a feasible spectrum allocation $\{a_{i,kt}\}_{i\in\mathcal{M}\bigcup\mathcal{N},k\in\{1,...,K\},t\in\{1,...,T\}}$, such that the spectrum efficiency W defined in (10) is maximized.

4. Problem Formulation

We first formulate the spectrum efficiency maximization (SEM) problem under deterministic (complete) network information (Section 4.1), which is essentially a *matching* problem, and can be solved by many existing algorithms. Then we formulate the expected spectrum efficiency maximization (E-SEM) problem under stochastic network information (Section 4.2), which is an *infinite-dimensional* optimization problem. We will focus on solving the E-SEM problem in Section 5.

4.1. Problem Formulation under Deterministic Information

With complete and deterministic network information, i.e., $\{\theta_{kt},\xi_{kt}\}_{k\in\{1,...,K\},t\in\{1,...,T\}}$, the spectrum efficiency maximization (SEM) problem can be formulated as a *matching* between all spectrums and all SUs, and the optimal solution explicitly specifies the allocation of every spectrum to a particular set of (independent) SUs. Let $a_{m,kt}^{\mathrm{S}} \in \{0,1\}$ (or $a_{n,kt}^{\mathrm{C}} \in \{0,1\}$) indicate whether to allocate a spectrum CH_{kt} to spot market user m (or contract user n). Denote:

$$\boldsymbol{a}_{kt} \triangleq \left(a_{1,kt}^{\mathrm{S}},...,a_{M,kt}^{\mathrm{S}};\ a_{1,kt}^{\mathrm{C}},...,a_{N,kt}^{\mathrm{C}}\right)$$

as the allocation (vector) of spectrum CH_{kt}, which contains the allocation of spectrum CH_{kt} to every SU. An *allocation strategy* consists of the allocations of all spectrums in the whole time period, denoted by $\boldsymbol{A}_{\mathrm{DET}} \triangleq \{\boldsymbol{a}_{kt}\}_{k\in\{1,...,K\},t\in\{1,...,T\}}$. Intuitively, the allocation strategy $\boldsymbol{A}_{\mathrm{DET}}$ is a mapping from every particular spectrum CH_{kt} to an allocation vector $\boldsymbol{a}_{kt}$.

By the Spatial Interference Constraint (SIC) given in Definition 2, an allocation strategy $\boldsymbol{A}_{\mathrm{DET}}$ is feasible, if and only if the allocation $\boldsymbol{a}_{kt}$ for every spectrum CH_{kt} satisfies:

$$\texttt{SIC}: \quad \textstyle\sum_{m\in\mathcal{C}_i\bigcap\mathcal{M}} a_{m,kt}^{\mathrm{S}} + \sum_{n\in\mathcal{C}_i\bigcap\mathcal{N}} a_{n,kt}^{\mathrm{C}} \le \xi_{kt}, \quad \forall \mathcal{C}_i \in \mathcal{C}(\mathrm{G}), \tag{11}$$

where $\mathcal{C}_i$ is the i-th clique of graph G, and $\mathcal{C}_i^1 \triangleq \mathcal{C}_i \bigcap \mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{C}_i^2 \triangleq \mathcal{C}_i \bigcap \mathcal{N}$ denote the spot market user set and contract user set in $\mathcal{C}_i$, respectively. It is easy to see that $a_{m,kt}^{\mathrm{S}} = a_{n,kt}^{\mathrm{C}} \equiv 0,\ \forall m,n$, if

[20] A spectrum allocation is feasible if it satisfies the spatial interference constraint (SIC) in Definition 2.

$\xi_{kt}=0$ (i.e., CH_{kt} is not idle). Intuitively, (11) states that (i) only idle spectrums can be used by SUs, and (ii) every idle spectrum can be allocated to, at most, one SU in a clique.

According to the definition of spectrum efficiency in Definition 4 and the SIC in (11), the spectrum efficiency maximization (SEM) problem can be formally defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\texttt{SEM}: \quad & \boldsymbol{A}^*_{\text{DET}}=\arg\max_{\boldsymbol{A}_{\text{DET}}} W \triangleq \sum_{m=1}^{M} w^{\text{S}}_m+\sum_{n=1}^{N}\left(\tau_n\cdot w^{\text{C}}_n+(1-\tau_n)\cdot \widetilde{w}^{\text{C}}_n\right)\\ & s.t. \quad a^{\text{S}}_{m,kt}\in\{0,1\},\ a^{\text{C}}_{n,kt}\in\{0,1\},\ \forall m\in\mathcal{M},\ \forall n\in\mathcal{N},\ \forall k\in\{1,\ldots,K\},\ \forall t\in\{1,\ldots,T\},\\ & \quad \texttt{SIC} \text{ defined in (11)},\ \forall k\in\{1,\ldots,K\},\ \forall t\in\{1,\ldots,T\},\\ & \quad D_n\geq d_n,\ \forall n\in\mathcal{N},\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where $d_n\triangleq\sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{t=1}^{T}a^{\text{C}}_{n,kt}\cdot\xi_{kt}$ is the number of spectrums allocated to contract user n. The last constraint in (12) states that none of the contract users will get spectrums more than his or her demand. The reason for this is that over-allocation brings trivial welfare gain for contract users. It is easy to see that the above problem is an 0-1 integer linear programming (also called matching problem), and many algorithms, e.g., branch-and-bound algorithm and Kuhn-Munkres algorithm (see Munkres (1957)), have been developed to solve a matching problem effectively. Due to space limitations, we omit the details here.

4.2. Problem Formulation under Stochastic Information

In practice, the assumption of complete and deterministic information is often unreasonable, as the network changes randomly over time. Hence, in this section we consider the case in which the network information is stochastic and the PR only knows its distribution, but not realization. In this case, we formulate the *expected* spectrum efficiency maximization (E-SEM) problem based on the stochastic distribution (e.g., PDF or CDF) of network information.[21] The solution specifies the allocation of any spectrum under every possible information realization (rather than the explicit allocation of every particular spectrum). In this sense, it essentially defines a contingency plan (also called a policy) for every spectrum under every possible information realization.

Based on the above, one may define the *allocation strategy* as a mapping from every possible information realization (rather than every particular spectrum, as under deterministic information) to an allocation vector consisting of the allocation probability to every SU. However, as shown in our technical report, Gao et al. (2012b), such a primitive definition is not appropriate due to the high complexity in determining the SIC constraint.

To this end, we propose a new definition for the allocation strategy. The basic idea is to *consider each independent SU set as a virtual player, and decide the spectrum allocation among the virtual*

[21] This stochastic network information can be obtained empirically after counting the realized network information over a sufficiently long time period. Note that in our technical report, Gao et al. (2012b), we also study the problem when this stochastic distribution information is *unavailable*. In that case, we propose a learning mechanism, which converges to the optimal solution without stochastic information.

players. That is, we transform the primitive allocation strategy, regarding the allocation probability (of every information realization) to every SU, into an equivalent strategy, regarding the allocation probability to every independent SU set.

Denote $\mathcal{I}_i \in \mathcal{I}(\mathrm{G})$ as the i-th independent set of the graph G, and $I \triangleq |\mathcal{I}(\mathrm{G})|$ as the total number of independent sets in the graph G. Let $a_i^{\mathrm{IS}}(\theta,\xi) \in [0,1]$ denote the allocation probability of a spectrum $\{\theta,\xi\}$ to independent SU set $\mathcal{I}_i$. The allocation probability vector of spectrum $\{\theta,\xi\}$ is:

$$\boldsymbol{a}_{\mathrm{IS}}(\theta,\xi) \triangleq \big(a_1^{\mathrm{IS}}(\theta,\xi), a_2^{\mathrm{IS}}(\theta,\xi), ..., a_I^{\mathrm{IS}}(\theta,\xi)\big),$$

and the new allocation strategy can be formally defined as follows.

Definition 5 (**Allocation Strategy**). An allocation strategy is a mapping from every information realization $\{\theta,\xi\}$ to a vector $\boldsymbol{a}_{\mathrm{IS}}(\theta,\xi)$ consisting of the allocation probability of a spectrum $\{\theta,\xi\}$ to every independent SU set, denoted by $\boldsymbol{A}_{\mathrm{IS}} \triangleq \{\boldsymbol{a}_{\mathrm{IS}}(\theta,\xi)\}_{\theta\in\boldsymbol{\Theta},\xi\in\{0,1\}}$.

Since the SUs in an independent set can use the same spectrum simultaneously, we can easily find that strategy $\boldsymbol{A}_{\mathrm{IS}}$ is feasible, if the allocation $\boldsymbol{a}_{\mathrm{IS}}(\theta,\xi)$ for every spectrum $\{\theta,\xi\}$ satisfies:

$$\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{I} a_i^{\mathrm{IS}}(\theta,\xi) \le \xi. \tag{13}$$

That is, the condition in (13) is *sufficient* for a feasible allocation strategy. The next question is whether it is able to represent all feasible allocations. The answer is YES, as shown below.

Proposition 1. *Any feasible allocation can be represented by an allocation strategy (defined in Definition 5) subject to the condition in (13).*

For detailed proof, please refer to our technical report, Gao et al. (2012b). Proposition 1 implies that the condition in (13) is an effective SIC constraint. From Proposition 1, we can see that the main advantage of such a transformation is that we can systematically identify the necessary and sufficient conditions of a feasible allocation strategy (i.e., the SIC constraint), which is essential for the E-SEM problem formulation. Certainly, this will bring some challenges, among which the most critical one is that the problem of finding all independent sets is NP-hard. This motivates our later study on the approximate algorithm and the associated performance loss analysis.

Next we can provide the E-SEM problem formulation based on the new allocation strategy. Let $l_n^i \in \{0,1\}$ (or $l_m^i \in \{0,1\}$) indicate whether a contract user n (or spot market user m) belongs to the i-th independent set, i.e., $l_n^i = 1$ if $n \in \mathcal{I}_i$, and $l_n^i = 0$ otherwise. Then, the total allocation probability of spectrum $\{\theta,\xi\}$ to contract users n or spot market user m can be written as:

$$a_m^{\mathrm{S}}(\theta,\xi) = \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{I} l_m^i \cdot a_i^{\mathrm{IS}}(\theta,\xi) \quad \text{and} \quad a_n^{\mathrm{C}}(\theta,\xi) = \sum_{i=1}^{I} l_n^i \cdot a_i^{\mathrm{IS}}(\theta,\xi). \tag{14}$$

Given a feasible allocation strategy $\boldsymbol{A}_{\mathrm{IS}}$, the expected welfare generated by a spot market m is:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[w_m^{\mathrm{S}}] &= \sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{\xi_{kt}=0}^{1} f_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(\xi_{kt})\cdot\xi_{kt}\int_{\theta_{kt}} a_m^{\mathrm{S}}(\theta_{kt},\xi_{kt})\cdot v_m(\theta_{kt})\cdot f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta_{kt})\mathrm{d}\theta_{kt}\\ &= S\cdot\sum_{\xi=0}^{1} f_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(\xi)\cdot\xi\int_{\theta} a_m^{\mathrm{S}}(\theta,\xi)\cdot v_m(\theta)\cdot f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta)\mathrm{d}\theta\\ &= \rho S\cdot\int_{\theta} a_m^{\mathrm{S}}(\theta,1)\cdot v_m(\theta)\cdot f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta)\mathrm{d}\theta,\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where $v_m(\theta)$ is the spot market user m's utility (i.e., the m-th element) in the utility vector $\theta=(v_1,...,v_M;\,u_1,...,u_N)$, and $f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta)$ is the joint PDF of $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$, i.e., $f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta)\triangleq\prod_{m=1}^{M} f_{\boldsymbol{v}_m}(v_m)\prod_{n=1}^{N} f_{\boldsymbol{u}_n}(u_n)$. The second equation follows because $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$ are i.i.d. across time and channels. The third equation follows because (i) $f_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(\xi)=1-\rho$ if $\xi=0$ and (ii) $f_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(\xi)=\rho$ if $\xi=1$. Note that we write $\mathrm{d}v_1...\mathrm{d}v_M\mathrm{d}u_1...\mathrm{d}u_N$ as $\mathrm{d}\theta$ and $\int_{v_1}...\int_{v_M}\int_{u_1}...\int_{u_N}$ as $\int_{\theta}$ for convenience.

The expected number of spectrums allocated to a contract user n is:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[d_n] &= \sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{\xi_{kt}=0}^{1} f_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(\xi_{kt})\cdot\xi_{kt}\int_{\theta_{kt}} a_n^{\mathrm{C}}(\theta_{kt},\xi_{kt})\cdot f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta_{kt})\mathrm{d}\theta_{kt}\\ &= \rho S\cdot\int_{\theta} a_n^{\mathrm{C}}(\theta,1)\cdot f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta)\mathrm{d}\theta.\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

From an individual perspective, the expected welfare generated by a contract user n is:

$$\mathbb{E}[w_n^{\mathrm{C}}] = B_n - \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}[d_n], D_n), \tag{17}$$

where $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}[d_n], D_n)$ is defined in (8). Note that the above welfare formula is based on the expected number of spectrums that the contract user n obtains, rather than the explicit number as in (7). The major motivation for this assumption is discussed in Section 3.3.

From a social utilization perspective, the expected welfare generated by a contract user n is:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{w}_n^{\mathrm{C}}] &= \sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{\xi_{kt}=0}^{1} f_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(\xi_{kt})\cdot\xi_{kt}\int_{\theta_{kt}} a_n^{\mathrm{C}}(\theta_{kt},\xi_{kt})\cdot u_n(\theta_{kt})\cdot f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta_{kt})\mathrm{d}\theta_{kt}\\ &= \rho S\cdot\int_{\theta} a_n^{\mathrm{C}}(\theta,1)\cdot u_n(\theta)\cdot f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta)\mathrm{d}\theta,\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where $u_n(\theta)$ is the contract user n's utility in the utility vector $\theta=(v_1,...,v_M;\,u_1,...,u_N)$.

The expected spectrum efficiency is the expected welfare generated by all SUs, that is:

$$\mathbb{E}[W]\triangleq\textstyle\sum_{m=1}^{M}\mathbb{E}[w_m^{\mathrm{S}}]+\sum_{n=1}^{N}\left(\tau_n\cdot\mathbb{E}[w_n^{\mathrm{C}}]+(1-\tau_n)\cdot\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{w}_n^{\mathrm{C}}]\right).$$

Therefore, we have the following expected spectrum efficiency maximization (E-SEM) problem:

$$\begin{aligned}
\texttt{E-SEM}: \quad \boldsymbol{A}^*_{\rm IS} = \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{A}_{\rm IS}} \ & \mathbb{E}[W] \triangleq \sum_{m=1}^{M} \mathbb{E}[w^{\rm S}_m] + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \Big(\tau_n \cdot \mathbb{E}[w^{\rm C}_n] + (1-\tau_n)\cdot \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{w}^{\rm C}_n]\Big) \\
s.t. \quad & a^{\rm IS}_i(\theta,\xi) \in [0,1], \ \forall \theta \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}, \forall \xi \in \{0,1\}, \forall i \in \{1,...,I\}, \\
& \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{I} a^{\rm IS}_i(\theta,\xi) \le \xi, \ \forall \theta \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}, \forall \xi \in \{0,1\}, \qquad (\texttt{SIC}) \\
& D_n \ge \mathbb{E}[d_n], \ \forall n \in \mathcal{N}.
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Obviously, the E-SEM problem (19) is an **infinite-dimensional** optimization problem (see Fattorini (1999)), in which the solution (or strategy) is not a number or a vector, but rather a continuous quantity. By the second constraint (SIC), we immediately have: $a^{\rm IS}_i(\theta,\xi) \equiv 0$ if $\xi = 0$, $\forall \theta \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}, \forall i = 1,...,I$. Therefore, in the rest of this paper, we will focus on solving $a^{\rm IS}_i(\theta,1), \forall \theta \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}, \forall i = 1,...,I$, i.e., the allocation of idle spectrums, denoted by $\boldsymbol{A}_{\rm IS,1} \triangleq \{\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm IS}(\theta,1)\}_{\theta\in\boldsymbol{\Theta}}$. **For notational convenience, we will write the tuple $\{\theta,1\}$ as θ, and thus denote $\boldsymbol{A}_{\rm IS,1} \triangleq \{\boldsymbol{a}_{\rm IS}(\theta)\}_{\theta\in\boldsymbol{\Theta}}$.**

5. Off-line Optimal Policy

In this section, we solve the E-SEM problem given in (19). We first reduce the strategy space by removing some *irrelevant* strategies, so as to reduce the computational complexity.[22] Then we derive the optimal solution systemically using the primal-dual method. Due to space limits, we present all proofs in our technical report, Gao et al. (2012b).

5.1. Allocation Strategy Reduction

Now we simplify the E-SEM problem (19) by restricting our attention to a particular subset of the strategy space. Define the **weight** of each vertex in the graph G as the utility of the associated SU. Notice that the welfare generated by a spot market user is exactly his or her utility, and thus we have: if an idle spectrum θ (or spectrum $\{\theta,1\}$) is allocated to an independent contract user set $\boldsymbol{n} \in \mathcal{I}(\mathrm{G}^{\rm C})$, it must be allocated to an MWIS of the side market $\mathrm{G}^{\rm S}_{\boldsymbol{n}}$ at the same time. This observation helps us to eliminate some strategies without affecting the optimality of the solution.

Let $\mathcal{I}^1_i \triangleq \mathcal{I}_i \bigcap \mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{I}^2_i \triangleq \mathcal{I}_i \bigcap \mathcal{N}$ denote the spot market user set and contract user set in $\mathcal{I}_i$ (i.e., the i-th independent set of graph G), respectively. Formally, we have:

Proposition 2. *Suppose $\boldsymbol{A}^*_{\rm IS,1} = \{\boldsymbol{a}^*_{\rm IS}(\theta)\}_{\theta\in\boldsymbol{\Theta}}$, where $\boldsymbol{a}^*_{\rm IS}(\theta) = \big(a^{\rm IS^*}_1(\theta),...,a^{\rm IS^*}_I(\theta)\big)$, is an optimal solution of (19). Then for any $\theta \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}$ we have: for every independent set $\mathcal{I}_i \in \mathcal{I}(\mathrm{G})$,*

*(a) If $\mathcal{I}^1_i$ is **not** an MWIS of the graph $\mathrm{G}^{\rm S}_{\mathcal{I}^2_i}$ (i.e., the side market (see Definition 1) of the contract user set $\mathcal{I}^2_i$), then $a^{\rm IS^*}_i(\theta) = 0$; or equivalently,*

(b) If $a^{\rm IS^*}_i(\theta) > 0$, then $\mathcal{I}^1_i$ must be an MWIS of the graph $\mathrm{G}^{\rm S}_{\mathcal{I}^2_i}$.

[22] The "irrelevant strategies" denote those that never emerge in an optimal solution. Therefore, ignoring the irrelevant strategies does not affect the optimality of the solution. We will show this in Proposition 2.

Proposition 2 implies that in an optimal solution, an idle spectrum θ will *never* be allocated to an independent set $\mathcal{I}_i = \mathcal{I}_i^1 \bigcup \mathcal{I}_i^2$ where $\mathcal{I}_i^1$ is *not* an MWIS of the graph $\mathrm{G}^{\mathrm{s}}_{\mathcal{I}_i^2}$. We refer to such an independent set $\mathcal{I}_i$ as an *irrelevant independent set*. Obviously, we can ignore those allocation strategies that allocate spectrums to the irrelevant independent sets, and focus only on the allocation among the "relevant" independent sets $\mathcal{I}_i$ (where $\mathcal{I}_i^1$ is an MWIS of the graph $\mathrm{G}^{\mathrm{s}}_{\mathcal{I}_i^2}$). In effect, we can restrict our attention to the independent sets of the futures market graph G^{c}, instead of the independent sets of the whole graph G: *if a spectrum is allocated to an independent contract user set (say $\boldsymbol{n}$) of G^{c}, it must be allocated to an MWIS of the side market graph $\mathrm{G}^{\mathrm{s}}_{\boldsymbol{n}}$ at the same time.* Consider the example in Fig. 1. Any idle spectrum will *not* be allocated to the independent set $\mathcal{I}_i = \{1,\ 6\}$, since $\{6\}$ is not an MWIS of $\mathrm{G}^{\mathrm{s}}_{\{1\}}$; otherwise, we can immediately increase the total welfare by reallocating the spectrum to another independent set $\mathcal{I}_j = \{1,\ 6,\ 8\}$.

The above result allows us to simplify the E-SEM problem. Denote $\mathcal{I}_i^{\mathrm{c}} \in \mathcal{I}(\mathrm{G}^{\mathrm{c}})$ as the i-th independent contract user set of the futures market graph G^{c}, and $I_{\mathrm{c}} \triangleq |\mathcal{I}(\mathrm{G}^{\mathrm{c}})|$ as the total number of independent sets of the graph G^{c}. Let $a_i^{\mathrm{ISc}}(\theta) \in [0,1]$ denote the allocation probability of an idle spectrum θ to the i-th independent contract user set $\mathcal{I}_i^{\mathrm{c}}$. [23] Formally, we can define the **reduced** allocation strategy as $\boldsymbol{A}_{\mathrm{ISc}} \triangleq \{\boldsymbol{a}_{\mathrm{ISc}}(\theta)\}_{\theta\in\boldsymbol{\Theta}}$, where

$$\boldsymbol{a}_{\mathrm{ISc}}(\theta) \triangleq \left(a_0^{\mathrm{ISc}}(\theta), a_1^{\mathrm{ISc}}(\theta), ..., a_{I_{\mathrm{c}}}^{\mathrm{ISc}}(\theta)\right)$$

is the reduced allocation probability vector of an idle spectrum θ, consisting of the allocation probability of spectrum $\{\theta, 1\}$ to every **independent contract user set** of the graph G^{c}. Note that the 0-th independent contract user set is simply defined as the empty set, i.e., $\mathcal{I}_0^{\mathrm{c}} = \emptyset$.

Similar to (13), a reduced allocation strategy $\boldsymbol{A}_{\mathrm{ISc}}$ is feasible, if and only if for every information realization $\{\theta, 1\}$, the reduced allocation probability vector $\boldsymbol{a}_{\mathrm{ISc}}(\theta)$ satisfies:

$$\texttt{SIC}: \quad \textstyle\sum_{i=0}^{I_{\mathrm{c}}} a_i^{\mathrm{ISc}}(\theta) \le 1. \tag{20}$$

By Proposition 2, if an idle spectrum θ is allocated to the i-th independent contract user set $\mathcal{I}_i^{\mathrm{c}}$, it must be allocated to an MWIS of the side market graph $\mathrm{G}^{\mathrm{s}}_{\mathcal{I}_i^{\mathrm{c}}}$ (denoted by $\mathcal{I}_i^{\mathrm{s}}$) at the same time. Let $z_i(\theta)$ denote the total weight of $\mathcal{I}_i^{\mathrm{s}}$. Obviously, $z_i(\theta)$ is the maximum total welfare generated by spot market users in the side market $\mathrm{G}^{\mathrm{s}}_{\mathcal{I}_i^{\mathrm{c}}}$ (over an idle spectrum θ), referred to as the **side welfare** of $\mathcal{I}_i^{\mathrm{c}}$. [24] Thus, given a feasible strategy $\boldsymbol{A}_{\mathrm{ISc}}$, the expected side welfare of $\mathcal{I}_i^{\mathrm{c}}$ is:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[W_i^{\mathrm{s}}] &= \sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\sum_{\xi_{kt}=0}^{1} f_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}(\xi_{kt})\cdot\xi_{kt}\int_{\theta_{kt}} a_i^{\mathrm{ISc}}(\theta_{kt},\xi_{kt})\cdot z_i(\theta_{kt})\cdot f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta_{kt})\mathrm{d}\theta_{kt} \\ &= \rho S\cdot\textstyle\int_\theta a_i^{\mathrm{ISc}}(\theta)\cdot z_i(\theta)\cdot f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta)\mathrm{d}\theta.\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

[23] Here the superscript "ISc" in $a_i^{\mathrm{ISc}}(\theta)$ is used to distinguish the allocation probability for each independent contract user set (of the graph G^{c}) from those for each individual SU or each independent set of graph G.

[24] Here the prefix "side" follows the fact that such a welfare is generated by spot market users along with the usage of contract user set $\mathcal{I}_i^{\mathrm{c}}$, i.e., it is a side effect of the allocation of contract user set $\mathcal{I}_i^{\mathrm{c}}$.

The expected total welfare generated by the spot market is the sum of the expected side welfare of all independent contract user sets (including the empty set), that is:

$$\mathbb{E}[W^{\mathrm{S}}] = \sum_{i=0}^{I_{\mathrm{C}}} \mathbb{E}[W_i^{\mathrm{S}}] = \sum_{i=0}^{I_{\mathrm{C}}} \Big(\rho S \cdot \int_{\theta} a_i^{\mathrm{ISC}}(\theta) \cdot z_i(\theta) \cdot f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta) \mathrm{d}\theta \Big). \tag{22}$$

Similar to (14), the allocation probability of an idle spectrum θ to a contract users n is:

$$a_n^{\mathrm{C}}(\theta) = \sum_{i=0}^{I_{\mathrm{C}}} l_n^i \cdot a_i^{\mathrm{ISC}}(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^{I_{\mathrm{C}}} l_n^i \cdot a_i^{\mathrm{ISC}}(\theta). \tag{23}$$

The 2nd equality follows because $l_n^0 \equiv 0$, $\forall n \in \mathcal{N}$ (since $\mathcal{I}_0^{\mathrm{C}} = \emptyset$). Furthermore, the expected number of spectrums allocated to contract user n (i.e., $\mathbb{E}[d_n]$) and the expected welfare generated by contract user n (i.e., $\mathbb{E}[w_n]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{w}_n]$) are given by (16)-(18) directly. The expected spectrum efficiency is:

$$\mathbb{E}[W] = \sum_{i=0}^{I_{\mathrm{C}}} \mathbb{E}[W_i^{\mathrm{S}}] + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \Big(\tau_n \cdot \mathbb{E}[w_n^{\mathrm{C}}] + (1-\tau_n) \cdot \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{w}_n^{\mathrm{C}}] \Big), \tag{24}$$

Based on the reduced allocation strategy $\boldsymbol{A}_{\mathrm{ISC}}$ and the associated expected spectrum efficiency formula in (24), we can rewrite the E-SEM in (19) into the following equivalent form:

$$\begin{aligned} \texttt{E-SEM(EQ)}: \quad \boldsymbol{A}_{\mathrm{ISC}}^* = \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{A}_{\mathrm{ISC}}} \ & \mathbb{E}[W] = \sum_{i=0}^{I_{\mathrm{C}}} \mathbb{E}[W_i^{\mathrm{S}}] + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \Big(\tau_n \cdot \mathbb{E}[w_n^{\mathrm{C}}] + (1-\tau_n) \cdot \mathbb{E}[\widetilde{w}_n^{\mathrm{C}}] \Big) \\ s.t. \quad & \text{(i)} \quad a_i^{\mathrm{ISC}}(\theta) \in [0,1], \ \forall \theta \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}, \forall i \in \{0,1,...,I_{\mathrm{C}}\}, \\ & \text{(ii)} \quad \sum_{i=0}^{I_{\mathrm{C}}} a_i^{\mathrm{ISC}}(\theta) \le 1, \ \forall \theta \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}, \qquad (\texttt{SIC}) \\ & \text{(iii)} \quad D_n \ge \mathbb{E}[d_n], \ \forall n \in \mathcal{N}. \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Notice that the independent sets in the futures market graph G^{C} are much less than in the whole graph G, since the number of independent sets increases exponentially with the number of vertices. Thus, by (25), we can greatly reduce the complexity of the E-SEM problem in (19). Recall the example in Fig. 1, there are a total of 26 independent sets in graph G, while only 6 in graph G^{C}.

5.2. Necessary Conditions

For exposition convenience, we will omit the superscript "ISC" in $a_i^{\mathrm{ISC}}(\theta)$, as long as there is no confusion caused. Suppose $\boldsymbol{A}_{\mathrm{ISC}}^* = \{\boldsymbol{a}_{\mathrm{ISC}}^*(\theta)\}_{\theta \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}}$ where $\boldsymbol{a}_{\mathrm{ISC}}^*(\theta) = \big(a_0^*(\theta), a_1^*(\theta), ..., a_{I_{\mathrm{C}}}^*(\theta)\big)$ is the optimal solution to (25). The following necessary conditions hold.

LEMMA 1 **(Necessary Condition I)**. *For any $\theta \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}$, we have: $\sum_{i=0}^{I_{\mathrm{C}}} a_i^*(\theta) = 1$.*

Intuitively, Lemma 1 states that every idle spectrum will be allocated to some SUs. This is because it can always produce certain positive welfare when used by spot market users.

LEMMA 2 **(Necessary Condition II)**. *For any contract user n, we have: $\mathbb{E}[d_n] \le D_n$.*

Intuitively, Lemma 2 states that none of the contract users will get spectrums (on average) more than his or her demand. This is because spectrum over-allocation to a contract user brings trivial welfare gain for the contract user (see the definition of contract user's welfare in Eq. [17]).

5.3. Optimal Solution

We focus on the optimal solution for soft contracts (with unit welfare loss for every under-allocated spectrum). The analysis for hard contracts (with a fixed total welfare loss for the unsatisfaction in demand) is similar and shown in our technical report, Gao et al. (2012b).

By Lemma 1, we can replace the decision variable $a_0(\theta)$ by $a_0(\theta) = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{I_C} a_i(\theta)$. By Lemma 2, we can rewrite the potential welfare loss in (8) as $\mathbb{P}(d_n, D_n) = (D_n - \mathbb{E}[d_n]) \cdot \widehat{P}_n$ (for soft contracts). Furthermore, by the 2nd constraint of the problem (25), we can simplify the 1st constraint as $a_i(\theta) \geq 0$, $\forall i$. Thus, the optimization problem (25) can be rewritten as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{A}^*_{\text{ISC}'} &= \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{A}_{\text{ISC}'}} \Big(\rho S \int_\theta \big(1 - \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{I_C} a_i(\theta)\big) z_0(\theta) f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta) \mathrm{d}\theta + \sum_{i=1}^{I_C} \rho S \int_\theta a_i(\theta) z_i(\theta) f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta) \mathrm{d}\theta \\
&\qquad + \textstyle\sum_{n=1}^{N} \big[\tau_n \cdot \big(B_n - (D_n - \mathbb{E}[d_n]) \cdot \widehat{P}_n\big) + (1-\tau_n) \cdot \rho S \int_\theta a_n^{\text{C}}(\theta) u_n(\theta) f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta) \mathrm{d}\theta\big]\Big) \\
&= \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{A}_{\text{ISC}'}} \Big(F + \rho S \cdot \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{I_C} \int_\theta H_i(\theta) a_i(\theta) f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta) \mathrm{d}\theta\Big), \\
s.t. \quad &\text{(i)} \quad a_i(\theta) \geq 0, \ \forall \theta \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}, \forall i \in \{1, ..., I_C\}; \\
&\text{(ii)} \quad \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{I_C} a_i(\theta) \leq 1, \ \forall \theta \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}; \\
&\text{(iii)} \quad \mathbb{E}[d_n] \leq D_n, \ \forall n \in \mathcal{N};
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

where

- $\boldsymbol{A}_{\text{ISC}'} = \{\boldsymbol{a}_{\text{ISC}'}(\theta)\}_{\theta \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}}$ with $\boldsymbol{a}_{\text{ISC}'}(\theta) = \big(a_1(\theta), ..., a_{I_C}(\theta)\big)$ is the reduced allocation strategy;
- $\mathbb{E}[d_n] = \rho S \int_\theta a_n^{\text{C}}(\theta) f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta) \mathrm{d}\theta = \sum_{i=1}^{I_C} l_n^i \cdot \rho S \int_\theta a_i(\theta) \cdot f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta) \mathrm{d}\theta$ is the expected number of spectrums allocated to the contract user n;
- $F = \rho S \cdot \int_\theta z_0(\theta) f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta) \mathrm{d}\theta + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \tau_n \cdot \big(B_n - \widehat{P}_n \cdot D_n\big)$ is a constant independent of the allocation;
- $H_i(\theta) = -z_0(\theta) + z_i(\theta) + \sum_{n=1}^{N} l_n^i \cdot \big(\tau_n \cdot \widehat{P}_n + (1-\tau_n) \cdot u_n(\theta)\big)$ is an information-specific variable.

To analytically solve the optimization problem (26), we first study the dual problem of (26) using the primal-dual method (see Dantzig (1998) for details). Then we determine the optimal dual variables, from which we further derive the optimal primal solution.

5.3.1. Primal-Dual Method We introduce Lagrange multipliers (also called *dual variables* or *shadow prices*) $\mu_i(\theta)$, $\eta(\theta)$, and λ_n for three constraints in (26). The Lagrangian is:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{LAG} = F &+ \rho S \cdot \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{I_C} \int_\theta H_i(\theta) a_i(\theta) f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta) \mathrm{d}\theta + \sum_{i=1}^{I_C} \int_\theta \mu_i(\theta) a_i(\theta) f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta) \mathrm{d}\theta \\
&+ \textstyle\int_\theta \eta(\theta) \Big(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{I_C} a_i(\theta)\Big) f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta) \mathrm{d}\theta + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \lambda_n \Big(D_n - \sum_{i=1}^{I_C} l_n^i \cdot \rho S \int_\theta a_i(\theta) \cdot f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta) \mathrm{d}\theta\Big),
\end{aligned}$$

which can be written as $\text{LAG} \triangleq \int_\theta \mathcal{W}(\theta) f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta) \mathrm{d}\theta$, where $\mathcal{W}(\theta)$, called Sub-Lagrangian, is given by

$$\mathcal{W}(\theta) \triangleq F + \eta(\theta) + \textstyle\sum_{n=1}^{N} \lambda_n D_n + \sum_{i=1}^{I_C} \Big(\rho S \cdot H_i(\theta) + \mu_i(\theta) - \eta(\theta) - \rho S \cdot \sum_{n=1}^{N} l_n^i \lambda_n\Big) \cdot a_i(\theta).$$

We define the *marginal welfare* (MW) as the first partial derivative of $\mathcal{L}(\theta)$ over each independent contract user set's allocation probability $a_i(\theta)$. Formally,

DEFINITION 6 (**Marginal Welfare – MW**).

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i(\theta) \triangleq \frac{\partial \mathcal{W}(\theta)}{\partial a_i(\theta)} = \rho S \cdot H_i(\theta) + \mu_i(\theta) - \eta(\theta) - \rho S \cdot \textstyle\sum_{n=1}^{N} l_n^i \cdot \lambda_n. \tag{27}$$

By Euler-Lagrange conditions for optimality (see Dantzig (1998)), if an inner optimal solution exists, the optimal solution $\boldsymbol{A}^*_{\text{ISC}'}(\theta)$ must satisfy the conditions: $\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i(\theta) = 0, \forall i$; otherwise, the optimal solution occurs at the boundaries. From Definition 6, we can see that the MW $\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i(\theta)$ is independent of $\boldsymbol{A}_{\text{ISC}'}(\theta)$. Thus, the optimal solution $\boldsymbol{A}^*_{\text{ISC}'}(\theta)$ must occur at the boundaries, that is:

$$a_i^*(\theta) = \begin{cases} 0, & \dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i(\theta) < 0 \\ 1, & \dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i(\theta) > 0 \end{cases} \tag{28}$$

By (27) and (28), the optimal solution is determined by the dual variables $\mu_i(\theta), \eta(\theta)$, and λ_n. By the primal-dual method (Dantzig (1998)), every dual variable must be nonnegative and is positive only when the associated constraint is tight, i.e., the following dual constraints hold:

$$\begin{cases} \text{(D.1)} \quad \mu_i^*(\theta) \geq 0,\ a_i^*(\theta) \geq 0,\ \mu_i^*(\theta) \cdot a_i^*(\theta) = 0, \quad \forall i \in \{1, ..., I_{\text{C}}\}, \forall \theta \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}; \\ \text{(D.2)} \quad \eta^*(\theta) \geq 0,\ 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{I_{\text{C}}} a_i^*(\theta) \geq 0,\ \eta^*(\theta) \cdot \big(1 - \sum_{i=1}^{I_{\text{C}}} a_i^*(\theta)\big) = 0, \quad \forall \theta \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}; \\ \text{(D.3)} \quad \lambda_n^* \geq 0,\ D_n - \sum_{i=1}^{I_{\text{C}}} l_n^i \cdot \rho S \int_\theta a_i^*(\theta) \cdot f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta) \mathrm{d}\theta \geq 0, \\ \qquad\quad \lambda_n^* \cdot \big(D_n - \sum_{i=1}^{I_{\text{C}}} l_n^i \cdot \rho S \int_\theta a_i^*(\theta) \cdot f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta) \mathrm{d}\theta\big) = 0, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N}. \end{cases}$$

By the duality principle, the primal problem (26) is equivalent to the problem of finding a set of optimal dual variables $\mu_i^*(\theta), \eta^*(\theta)$, and λ_n^*, such that all dual constraints are satisfied (dual problem). The optimality of this approach is guaranteed as the objective and constraints in (26) are linear, which implies that (26) is a convex optimization problem.

For convenience, we further introduce the concepts of *inner marginal welfare* (I-MW) and *core marginal welfare* (C-MW), which will be frequently used in the later discussion.

DEFINITION 7 (**Inner Marginal Welfare – I-MW**).

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\text{IN}}(\theta) \triangleq \rho S \cdot H_i(\theta) - \eta(\theta) - \rho S \cdot \textstyle\sum_{n=1}^{N} l_n^i \cdot \lambda_n. \tag{29}$$

DEFINITION 8 (**Core Marginal Welfare – C-MW**).

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\text{CO}}(\theta) \triangleq \rho S \cdot H_i(\theta) - \rho S \cdot \textstyle\sum_{n=1}^{N} l_n^i \cdot \lambda_n. \tag{30}$$

It is easy to see that $\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\text{IN}}(\theta) = \dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i(\theta) - \mu_i(\theta)$ and $\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\text{CO}}(\theta) = \dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i(\theta) - \mu_i(\theta) + \eta(\theta)$. That is, both I-MW and C-MW are variations of MW by ignoring certain non-critical dual variables in the MW. This is also the reason that we refer to them as "inner" and "core" marginal welfares.

5.3.2. Optimal Shadow Prices and Optimal Solution Now we study the optimal shadow prices (dual variables) and optimal primal solution.

We start by showing the necessary conditions for the optimal $\mu_i^*(\theta)$. Specifically,

LEMMA 3 **(Feasible Range of $\mu_i^*(\theta)$)**. *The optimal shadow prices $\mu_i^*(\theta)$ must satisfy:*
(a) $\mu_i^*(\theta)=0$, *if* $\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\text{IN}}(\theta)\geq 0$, *and* (b) $\mu_i^*(\theta)\in[0,\ |\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\text{IN}}(\theta)|]$, *if* $\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\text{IN}}(\theta)<0$.

Notice that $\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i(\theta)=\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\text{IN}}(\theta)+\mu_i^*(\theta)$. Lemma 3 implies that (a) $\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\text{IN}}(\theta)\geq 0$ if and only if $\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i(\theta)\geq 0$, and (b) $\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\text{IN}}(\theta)<0$ if and only if $\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i(\theta)\leq 0$. That is, $\mu_i^*(\theta)$ never changes the sign of the MW $\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i(\theta)$, which implies that $\mu_i^*(\theta)$ has no impact on the optimal solution (28). Intuitively, this is because the optimal solution given by (28) never violates the first constraint (associated with shadow prices $\mu_i(\theta)$) of the primal problem (26). To better understand Lemma 3, we provide an illustration of $\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\text{IN}}(\theta)$, $\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i(\theta)$, and the feasible range of $\mu_i^*(\theta)$ (shown as the shadow area) in Fig. 3, in which Region II corresponds to case (a), and Regions I and III correspond to case (b) in Lemma 3. In Region II, the optimal $\mu_i^*(\theta)$ is 0, and thus $\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i(\theta)=\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\text{IN}}(\theta)\geq 0$. In Region I or III, the optimal $\mu_i^*(\theta)$ is in the shadow area, and thus $\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i(\theta)=\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\text{IN}}(\theta)+\mu_i^*(\theta)\leq 0$.

Next we show the necessary conditions for the optimal $\eta^*(\theta)$. Denote:

$$\dot{W}_{1\text{st}}(\theta)\triangleq\max_{i\in\{1,\ldots,I_{\text{C}}\}}\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\text{CO}}(\theta)\ \text{ and }\ \dot{W}_{2\text{nd}}(\theta)\triangleq\max_{i\in\{1,\ldots,I_{\text{C}}\}/\{i_1\}}\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\text{CO}}(\theta)$$

as the highest and second-highest C-MWs among all independent contract user sets, respectively, where $i_1\triangleq\arg\max_{i\in\{1,\ldots,I_{\text{C}}\}}\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\text{CO}}(\theta)$. The feasible range of $\eta^*(\theta)$ is shown as follows.

LEMMA 4 **(Feasible Range of $\eta^*(\theta)$)**. *The optimal shadow prices $\eta^*(\theta)$ must satisfy:*
(a) $\eta^*(\theta)\in[\max(0,\dot{W}_{2\text{nd}}(\theta)),\ \dot{W}_{1\text{st}}(\theta)]$, *if* $\dot{W}_{1\text{st}}(\theta)>0$, *and* (b) $\eta^*(\theta)=0$, *if* $\dot{W}_{1\text{st}}(\theta)\leq 0$.

Notice that $\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i(\theta)=\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\text{CO}}(\theta)+\mu_i^*(\theta)-\eta^*(\theta)$ and $\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\text{IN}}(\theta)=\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\text{CO}}(\theta)-\eta^*(\theta)$. That is, the shadow price $\eta^*(\theta)$ can be viewed as an *identical* reduction on all C-MWs (at a particular θ). Lemma 4 suggests that a feasible $\eta^*(\theta)$ would lie between $\dot{W}_{1\text{st}}(\theta)$ and $\max(0,\dot{W}_{2\text{nd}}(\theta))$, with which there is, at most, one independent contract user set (the i_1-th one $\mathcal{I}_{i_1}^{\text{C}}$, if exists) having positive I-MW, i.e., $\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\text{IN}}(\theta)\leq 0$, $\forall i\neq i_1$. We therefore have $\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i(\theta)\leq 0$ and $a_i^*(\theta)=0$, $\forall i\neq i_1$ by Lemma 3 and (28). Thus, the coupling constraint (ii) will be satisfied. To better understand Lemma 4, we provide an illustration of $\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\text{CO}}(\theta)$, $\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i(\theta)$, and $\eta^*(\theta)$ (shown as the shadow areas) in Fig. 4. Here we have two independent contract user sets, $i=1,2$. The upper dash curve denotes $\dot{W}_{1\text{st}}(\theta)$, the highest C-MW of two independent sets. The lower dash curve denotes $\dot{W}_{2\text{nd}}(\theta)$, the second highest (i.e., lowest) C-MW of two independent sets. Regions I and II correspond to case (a) where $\dot{W}_{1\text{st}}(\theta)>0$, and the remaining regions correspond to case (b) where $\dot{W}_{1\text{st}}(\theta)\leq 0$. It is easy to see that in Region I (or II), the 1st (or 2nd) independent set realizes the highest positive C-MW, i.e., $\dot{W}_{1\text{st}}(\theta)=\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_1^{\text{CO}}(\theta)>0$ (or $\dot{W}_{1\text{st}}(\theta)=\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_2^{\text{CO}}(\theta)>0$), and thus given any feasible $\eta^*(\theta)$ in the shadow area, the 1st (or 2nd) independent set has the unique positive marginal welfare.

By Lemmas 3 and 4, we can find that the optimal solution given by (28) is equivalent to such a solution that allocates spectrums to the independent contract user set with the highest and positive C-MW (and meanwhile the associated side market). Denote $\boldsymbol{i}_1\triangleq\{i\in\{1,\ldots,I_{\text{C}}\}\mid\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\text{CO}}(\theta)=\dot{W}_{1\text{st}}(\theta)\}$



Figure 3 Illustration of $\mu_i^*(\theta)$ in Lemma 3



Figure 4 Illustration of $\eta^*(\theta)$ in Lemma 4

as the collection of independent sets with the highest C-MW (over a spectrum $\{\theta, 1\}$). Formally, we have the following optimal solution.

LEMMA 5 **(Optimal Allocation Strategy)**. *For any idle spectrum θ, the optimal allocation strategy $\boldsymbol{A}^*_{\text{ISC}'}(\theta)$ is given by:* (i) *if $i \notin \boldsymbol{i}_1$, then $a_i^*(\theta) = 0$; and* (ii) *if $i \in \boldsymbol{i}_1$, then*

(ii.a) $a_i^*(\theta) \in [0,1]$ *such that* $\sum_{i\in\boldsymbol{i}_1} a_i^*(\theta) = 1$, *if* $\dot{W}_{1\text{st}}(\theta) > 0$;
(ii.b) $a_i^*(\theta) \in [0,1]$ *such that* $\sum_{i\in\boldsymbol{i}_1} a_i^*(\theta) \le 1$, *if* $\dot{W}_{1\text{st}}(\theta) = 0$;
(ii.c) $a_i^*(\theta) = 0$, *if* $\dot{W}_{1\text{st}}(\theta) < 0$;

Lemma 5 states that in the optimal solution, only the independent contract user sets with the highest positive C-MW may obtain an idle spectrum θ. If the C-MW is negative for all independent contract user sets (i.e., $\dot{W}_{1\text{st}}(\theta) < 0$), the spectrum is allocated to the 0-th independent contract user set (empty set) and the associated side market (the whole spot market). For example, in Fig. 4, we have $\boldsymbol{i}_1 = \{1\}$ in Regions I and I′ (on the left side of Region I) and $\boldsymbol{i}_1 = \{2\}$ in Regions II and II′ (on the right side of Region II). Thus, we have $a_1^*(\theta) = a_2^*(\theta) = 0$ in Regions I′ and II′ since $\dot{W}_{1\text{st}}(\theta) < 0$; $a_1^*(\theta) = 1, a_2^*(\theta) = 0$ in Region I; and $a_1^*(\theta) = 0, a_2^*(\theta) = 1$ in Region II.

When SUs have continuous and heterogeneous utilities, the realization of θ such that $\dot{W}_{1\text{st}}(\theta) = 0$ (i.e., case (b) in Lemma 5) or $|\boldsymbol{i}_1| > 1$ (i.e., multiple independent sets having the same highest C-MP) has a zero size support, and therefore can be ignored. Thus, the optimal allocation given by Lemma 5 is equivalent to:

$$a_i^*(\theta) = 1 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\text{Co}}(\theta) > 0 \text{ and } \dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\text{Co}}(\theta) > \max_{j\neq i} \dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_j^{\text{Co}}(\theta). \tag{31}$$

Recall the example in Figure 4. There are two distinct realizations of θ such that $\dot{W}_{1\text{st}}(\theta) = 0$, i.e., the boundary points between Region I and I′ and between Region II and II′. In addition, there is only one distinct realization of θ such that $|\boldsymbol{i}_1| > 1$, i.e., the boundary point between Region I and II. Obviously, these realizations have a zero size support.

Now let us look into (31) to gain further insights. First, notice that:

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\text{Co}}(\theta) = \rho S \cdot \Big(- z_0(\theta) + z_i(\theta) + \textstyle\sum_{n=1}^{N} l_n^i \cdot \big(\tau_n \cdot \widehat{P}_n + (1-\tau_n)\cdot u_n(\theta)\big) - \sum_{n=1}^{N} l_n^i \cdot \lambda_n \Big).$$

The first term $z_0(\theta)$ is the side welfare (from a spectrum $\{\theta, 1\}$) of the 0-th independent contract user set (empty set). That is, it is the welfare generated by the spot market users, when the spectrum is not allocated to any contract user. In this sense, it can be viewed as an *outside option* with regard to the futures market. The second term $z_i(\theta)$ is the side welfare of the i-th independent contract user set. That is, it is the welfare generated by the spot market users (in the associated side market), when the spectrum is allocated to the i-th independent contract user set. The third term $\sum_{n=1}^{N} l_n^i \cdot \big(\tau_n \cdot \widehat{P}_n + (1-\tau_n)\cdot u_n(\theta)\big)$ denotes the direct welfare *improvement* (also called *welfare gain*) generated by the contract users in the i-th independent contract user set from a spectrum $\{\theta, 1\}$.[25] The last term $\sum_{n=1}^{N} l_i^n \cdot \lambda_n^*$ is the shadow prices of the i-th independent contract user set, which imposes an identical "shade" on the C-MW of the i-th independent set over all spectrums. It is used to rule out the relatively low welfare spectrums and assign the high welfare spectrums to the i-th independent contract user set.

Let $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_i^+ \triangleq \big\{\theta \mid \dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\text{Co}}(\theta) > 0 \ \&\ \dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\text{Co}}(\theta) > \max_{j\neq i} \dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_j^{\text{Co}}(\theta)\big\}$ denote the set of spectrum information θ with which the i-th independent contract user set having the unique highest and positive C-MP. Since $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_i^+$ is determined by the shadow prices (vector) $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^* \triangleq (\lambda_1^*, ..., \lambda_N^*)$, we can write $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_i^+$ as a function of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*$, denoted by $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_i^+(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)$. The optimal solution is therefore equivalent to: $a_i^*(\theta) = 1$ if and only if $\theta \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}_i^+(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)$. Accordingly, the set of spectrums allocated to a contract user n can be written as: $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n^+ = \bigcup_{i=1}^{I_{\text{C}}} l_n^i \odot \boldsymbol{\Theta}_i^+$, where $l_n^i \odot \boldsymbol{\Theta}_i^+ = \emptyset$ if $l_n^i = 0$ and $l_n^i \odot \boldsymbol{\Theta}_i^+ = \boldsymbol{\Theta}_i^+$ if $l_n^i = 1$. Furthermore, the expected number of spectrums allocated to a contract user n can be written as: $\mathbb{E}[d_n] = \rho S \int_{\theta \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n^+(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*)} f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta) \mathrm{d}\theta$. According to the dual constraints (D.3), the optimal shadow price λ_n^* is either 0 if the associated constraint (iii) is not tight, or otherwise a non-negative value that makes the associated constraint tight. Formally,

LEMMA 6 **(Optimal Shadow Price λ_n^*).** *The optimal shadow price λ_n^* is given by:*

$$\lambda_n^* = \max\big\{0, \quad \arg_{\lambda_n} \rho S \textstyle\int_{\theta \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n^+(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{-n}^*, \lambda_n)} f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta) \mathrm{d}\theta = D_n\big\}, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{-n}^*$ is the vector of all independent contract user sets' shadow prices except that of the i-th independent set, i.e., $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{-n}^* \triangleq (\lambda_1^*, ..., \lambda_{n-1}^*, \lambda_{n+1}^*, ..., \lambda_N^*)$.

[25] Specifically, if the PR allocates a spectrum $\{\theta, 1\}$ to the i-th independent contract user set, the total welfare generated by those contract users is $\sum_{n=1}^{N} l_n^i \cdot (\tau_n \cdot \frac{B_n}{D_n} + (1-\tau_n)\cdot u_n(\theta))$; whereas, if the PR does not allocate the spectrum $\{\theta, 1\}$ to the i-th independent set, the total welfare is $\sum_{n=1}^{N} l_n^i \cdot (\tau_n \cdot (\frac{B_n}{D_n} - \widehat{P}_n))$. That is, there is no utilization-based welfare and every contract user in the independent set suffers a unit welfare loss $\widehat{P}_n$. Here, the welfare loss $\widehat{P}_n$ is implied by Lemma 2, which states that each contract user can never get spectrums more than his or her demand. Thus, by allocating one less spectrum to the contract user, he or she must suffer a unit welfare loss $\widehat{P}_n$. Based on above, the welfare gain is $\sum_{n=1}^{N} l_n^i \cdot \big(\tau_n \cdot \widehat{P}_n + (1-\tau_n)\cdot u_n(\theta)\big)$.

After obtaining the optimal shadow price vector $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*$ and substituting the optimal $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*$ into the C-MWs of all independent contract user sets, we can easily determine the optimal allocation of any spectrum under any information $\{\theta, 1\}$ according to Lemma 5 or (31). Intuitively, the shadow price λ_n^* imposes a *vertical* (downward) shift on the C-MPs of those independent sets containing the contract user n, such that $\mathbb{E}[d_n]$ meets the demand D_n.

5.4. The Optimal Policy

We now summarize the *optimal policy* based on the optimal solution derived above. Simply speaking, a policy is a set of pre-defined **allocation rules**, specifying explicitly or implicitly the allocation of any spectrum under every possible information realization. We will show that the optimal solution in Lemma 5 is equivalent to such a policy that allocates every spectrum to an MWIS of the graph G with well-defined weights. Formally, we show this in the following theorem.

THEOREM 1 **(Optimal Policy)**. *For any idle spectrum with information realization* $\{\theta, 1\}$*,*

- *Define the* ***weight*** *of each vertex of graph* G *in the following way:*
  - *The weight of each spot market user* m *is:* v_m*;*
  - *The weight of each contract user* n *is:* $\tau_n \cdot \widehat{P}_n + (1-\tau_n) \cdot u_n(\theta) - \lambda_n^*$*;*
- *Allocate the spectrum* $\{\theta, 1\}$ *to an* ***MWIS*** *of the weighted graph* G *defined above.*

By the optimal policy in Theorem 1, every spectrum will be allocated to an MWIS of G, where the weight of each vertex (SU) is defined as his *current* utility directly for spot market users or a function of his *current* utility for contract users. That is, the weight is related to the realized actual information of the current spectrum and the optimal policy only, but independent of the information of future or past spectrums. In this sense, we disentangle the time-coupled spectrum allocation problem (which determines the spectrum allocations in all time slots jointly based on the complete network information) into a set of sub-problems. Each sub-problem determines the spectrum allocation in a particular time slot based on the currently realized information and the pre-derived optimal shadow prices. The coupling relationship of allocations in different time slots is captured by the pre-derived optimal shadow prices (in Lemma 6).

6. On-line VCG Mechanisms

In the previous section, we have shown in Theorem 1 that the E-SEM problem can be disentangled into a set of sub-problems, each determining the allocation of one particular spectrum. More specifically, every spectrum is allocated to an MWIS of the graph G, in which the weight of each vertex is related only to the utility of the associated SU over the spectrum, while independent of his or her utilities over other spectrums or the utility of other SUs.

Obviously, if the PR can observe all of the realized information of one spectrum, it is straightforward to determine the optimal allocation of that spectrum, based on Theorem 1. As mentioned

previously, however, the SU's utility information is private, and usually cannot be observed by the PR. That is, the network information is asymmetric between the PR and SUs. In this case, the real-time allocation of every spectrum essentially depends on the SUs' reports (also called *bids*) about their utilities. SUs may have incentives to falsely report their utilities to enlarge their welfare. Therefore, an incentive compatible mechanism is necessary for credibly eliciting the SUs' private utilities and then optimally allocating every spectrum.

6.1. VCG Mechanism

We first propose a VCG auction, which is incentive-compatible for SUs to truthfully report their private utilities, and is optimal for the real-time allocation of every spectrum. Essentially, a VCG auction charges each SU a fee if his or her report is *pivotal*, i.e., if his or her report changes the optimal allocation so as to harm other SUs. Let $\widetilde{v}_m$ and $\widetilde{u}_n$ denote the reports (i.e., bids) of spot market user m and contract user n. Denote $\widetilde{\theta} \triangleq \left(\widetilde{v}_1, ..., \widetilde{v}_M; \widetilde{u}_1, ..., \widetilde{u}_N\right)$ as the bid vector of all SUs. Formally, the VCG based spectrum allocation and charging mechanism is shown as follows.

Mechanism 1 (VCG auction) *For any idle spectrum with a bid vector* $\widetilde{\theta}$*,*

- *Define the* ***weight*** *of each vertex of graph* G *in the following way:*
  - *The weight of each spot market user* m *is:* $x_m \triangleq \widetilde{v}_m$*;*
  - *The weight of each contract user* n *is:* $x_n \triangleq \tau_n \cdot \widehat{P}_n + (1-\tau_n) \cdot \widetilde{u}_n(\theta) - \lambda_n^*$*;*
- *Allocate the spectrum to an* ***MWIS*** *of the above weighted graph* G*:*
  - *Denote* $\mathcal{I}^* \in \mathcal{I}(\mathrm{G})$ *as the allocated independent set, i.e.,* $\sum_{j\in\mathcal{I}^*} x_j \geq \sum_{j\in\mathcal{I}_i} x_j,\ \forall \mathcal{I}_i \in \mathcal{I}(\mathrm{G})$*;*
- *Charge each SU* k *in the following way:*
  - *Denote* $\mathcal{I}_{-k}^* \in \mathcal{I}(\mathrm{G}_{-k})$ *as an MWIS of* G_{-k}*, the graph consisting of all SUs except* k*;*
  - *Charge the SU* k *a critical price defined as:* $p_k \triangleq \sum_{j\in\mathcal{I}_{-k}^*} x_j - \sum_{j\in\mathcal{I}^*/\{k\}} x_j$*.*

The above mechanism is a standard VCG auction, and thus it leads to truth-telling. The novelty of our VCG auction is that the bid of each contract user n is not exogenously given, but rather related to the optimal shadow prices λ_n^* derived in the previous section. Hence, such a solution (i.e., the off-line policy and the on-line VCG auction) allows us to optimally allocate every spectrum in an on-line manner under stochastic and asymmetric network information.

It is notable that the above spectrum auction with spatial spectrum reuse is mathematically equivalent to the auction with single-minded buyers proposed in Nisan (2007). Specifically, in an auction with single-minded buyers, each bidder requests a specific bundle of items, and achieves a positive revenue if obtaining this bundle of items, and zero otherwise. We can view any two bidders with non-conflicting requirements (i.e., there is no intersection between their requested bundles of items) as non-conflicting (independent) buyers, based on which we can construct such a conflict graph in which conflicting bidders are connected by an edge and non-conflicting bidders

are disconnected. Accordingly, a set of independent bidders (i.e., those not connected by edges) can be chosen as auction winners at the same time. This is equivalent to the single-slot spectrum auction in our work. We would like to emphasize that our work is not restricted to the study of the single-slot spectrum auction (in a particular time slot). In fact, we focus on the auction of spectrum in a period of T time slots. This multi-slot spectrum allocation problem is essentially a combination of T coupled single-slot spectrum auction problems (which are coupled by the optimal shadow prices derived in advance). This is also the key difference between our work and the single-minded auction in Nisan (2007).

Next we provide some comments on this mechanism. First, as shown in Section 3.3, the contract user's actual payment is determined only by the number of spectrums that he or she obtains, while independent of the utility. In the above VCG auction, however, the contract user's payment depends on his or her utility. Actually, we can view a contract user's payment in the VCG auction as a subsidy that encourages the contract user to report truthfully. Second, if an SU k is not allocated a spectrum (i.e., $k \notin \mathcal{I}^*$), then we have $\mathcal{I}^*_{-k} = \mathcal{I}^*$, and thus his payment is $p_k = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}^*_{-k}} x_j - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}^*/\{k\}} x_j = 0$. Third, the above VCG auction relies on the solving of MWIS problems, which are well-known to be NP-hard. Thus, the VCG auction may not be suitable for large networks. This motivates us to further study a low-complexity mechanism instead.

6.2. VCG-like Mechanism

Due to the spatial spectrum reuse, the VCG auction in Mechanism 1 requires a solution to the MWIS problem, which is NP-hard. Thus, the above VCG auction is not suitable for on-line implementation. To this end, we further propose a low-complexity *VCG-like mechanism*, based on approximate MWIS algorithms with polynomial-time complexity. Formally, the VCG-like spectrum allocation and charging mechanism works in the following way.

Mechanism 2 (VCG-like Mechanism) *For any idle spectrum with a bid vector $\widetilde{\theta}$,*

- *Define the **weight** of each vertex in the graph G in the following way:*
  - *The weight of each spot market user m is: $x_m \triangleq \widetilde{v}_m$;*
  - *The weight of each contract user n is: $x_n \triangleq \tau_n \cdot \widehat{P}_n + (1-\tau_n) \cdot \widetilde{u}_n(\theta) - \lambda^*_n$;*
- *Allocate each spectrum in the following greedy way: Define the survival SU set $\mathcal{N}^\dagger = \mathcal{N}$*
  - *Do until $\mathcal{N}^\dagger = \emptyset$: Allocate the spectrum to the maximum weight SU in $\mathcal{N}^\dagger$, and*
    Remove this SU as well as the neighboring SUs from $\mathcal{N}^\dagger$;
  - *Denote $\mathcal{I}^\dagger \in \mathcal{I}(\mathrm{G})$ as the allocated independent SU set;*
- *Charge each SU k in the following way:*
  - *Denote $\mathcal{I}^\dagger_{-k} \in \mathcal{I}(\mathrm{G}_{-k})$ as the allocated SU set using the above allocation mechanism on G_{-k};*
  - *Charge the SU k a critical price defined as: $p_k \triangleq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}^\dagger_{-k}} x_j - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}^\dagger/\{k\}} x_j$.*

The key difference between this VCG-like mechanism and the previous VCG auction lies in the allocation strategy. Specifically, in the VCG auction, every spectrum is allocated to an MWIS of SUs; whereas, in the VCG-like mechanism, every spectrum is allocated to a set of SUs based on a greedy algorithm. Some important observations are as follows. First, the above VCG-like mechanism has a polynomial-time complexity. Second, the above VCG-like mechanism leads to truth-telling (under this greedy allocation mechanism). This can be easily proved by the monotonicity property and bid-independent property (see Krishna (2009)). Third, the above VCG-like mechanism is *not* optimal due to the lack of optimal algorithm for MWIS calculations. The welfare loss caused by this non-optimal VCG-like mechanism will be studied in the next section.

7. Welfare Loss Analysis

Now we study the welfare loss induced by the approximate MWIS algorithms. We first notice that the E-SEM problem in (25) depends only on the stochastic distribution information, and the optimal solution (policy) can be derived in an *off-line* manner. That is, we can enumerate all possible scenarios and calculate the corresponding solution beforehand. In this sense, we can always apply the precise MWIS algorithm to compute the off-line optimal policy exactly. Hence, the approximate MWIS algorithms only affect the real-time allocation of every spectrum (which must be determined in an *on-line* manner).

In the previous section, we have proposed a specific on-line VCG-like mechanism (based on a greedy approximate MWIS algorithm) for the real-time allocation of every spectrum. Now we characterize the welfare loss under *generic* VCG-like mechanisms, or equivalently, under generic approximate MWIS algorithms. This quantitative analysis helps us to achieve a desirable tradeoff between performance and complexity.

7.1. Precise and Approximate C-MWs

We first examine how an approximate MWIS algorithm affects the achieved performance. By Lemma 5, the optimal allocation of every spectrum θ relies on the *accurate calculations* of $z_i(\theta), \forall i = 0, 1, ..., I_{\mathrm{C}}$, i.e., the side welfare of the i-th independent contract user set. With the above VCG-like mechanism, however, we can only get an approximate (degraded) side welfare $\tilde{z}_i(\theta)$ with certain performance guarantee. This degradation will potentially change the relationship between C-MWs, and further change the spectrum allocation. For example, a relatively larger (smaller) degradation on the side welfare $z_i(\theta)$ will lead to a smaller (larger) C-MW, and therefore a smaller (larger) allocation probability to the i-th independent contract user set.

Without loss of generality, we treat the performance ratio (i.e., the ratio of the achieved performance and the optimal performance) of the adopted approximate MWIS algorithm as a random variable drawn from $[0, 1]$. Let random variable $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i$ denote the performance ratio of the MWIS

problem of calculating $z_i(\theta)$, and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \triangleq (\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_0, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_1, ..., \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{I_C})$ denote the random vector consisting of the performance ratios of all $I_C + 1$ MWIS problems. Let $\epsilon_i \in [0, 1]$ denote a particular realization of the random variable $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i$, and $\epsilon \triangleq (\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1, ..., \epsilon_{I_C})$ denote a particular realization of the random vector $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$. For simplicity and without loss of generality, we assume that all performance ratios in vector $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ are independent of each other, but they are not necessarily identically distributed.

For any spectrum $\{\theta, 1\}$, the *precise* C-MW of the i-th independent contract user set is

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\mathrm{Co}}(\theta) = \rho S \cdot \Big(- z_0(\theta) + z_i(\theta) + \textstyle\sum_{n=1}^{N} l_n^i \cdot \big(\tau_n \cdot \widehat{P}_n + (1 - \tau_n) \cdot u_n(\theta) - \lambda_n^*\big)\Big), \tag{32}$$

while the *approximate* C-MW under certain performance ratio realization of $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ is:

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\mathrm{Co}}(\theta) = \rho S \cdot \Big(- \epsilon_0 \cdot z_0(\theta) + \epsilon_i \cdot z_i(\theta) + \textstyle\sum_{n=1}^{N} l_n^i \cdot \big(\tau_n \cdot \widehat{P}_n + (1 - \tau_n) \cdot u_n(\theta) - \lambda_n^*\big)\Big). \tag{33}$$

7.2. Welfare Loss and Performance Ratio

Now we study the welfare loss and the achievable performance ratio. We can divide the whole spectrum range $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$ into $I_C + 1$ parts based on the allocated independent contract user set under the optimal allocation policy: (i) $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_1$, $i = 1, ..., I_C$, the spectrums intended for the i-th independent contract user set; and (ii) $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_0$, the spectrums intended for the spot market only. Formally,

$$\begin{cases} \boldsymbol{\Theta}_i = \{\theta \in \boldsymbol{\Theta} \mid \dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\mathrm{Co}}(\theta) > 0 \ \& \ \dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\mathrm{Co}}(\theta) > \max\limits_{j \neq i} \dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_j^{\mathrm{Co}}(\theta)\}, \quad i = 1, ..., I_C. \\ \boldsymbol{\Theta}_0 = \{\theta \in \boldsymbol{\Theta} \mid \dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\mathrm{Co}}(\theta) < 0, \forall i = 1, ..., I_C\}. \end{cases}$$

In the following, we will first derive the welfare loss (upper-bound) in each part of $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$. Then we characterize the achievable performance ratio (lower-bound).

7.2.1. Welfare Loss in $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_i$ We first consider the welfare loss on spectrums in $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_i$. Under the optimal allocation policy based on precise C-MWs, every idle spectrum θ in $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_i$ is allocated to the i-th independent contract user set (and the associated side market) with an instantaneous welfare:

$$z_i(\theta) + \textstyle\sum_{n=1}^{N} l_n^i \cdot (1 - \tau_n) \cdot u_n(\theta).$$

The first term denotes the side welfare, and the second term denotes the (utilization-based) welfare of the i-th independent contract user set. Note that we ignore the personal welfare B_n of each contract user n, since it is constant and not affected by the mis-allocation; we also ignore the potential welfare loss induced by under-allocation here, which will be analyzed specifically later.

Obviously, with precise C-MWs (using optimal MWIS algorithms), the i-th independent contract user set has the highest positive C-MW among all independent sets. With approximate C-MWs (using approximate MWIS algorithms), however, there are possibly three different outcomes, each leading to a different allocation and thus a different welfare loss. Specifically,

(1) *The i-th independent contract user set itself has the highest and positive approximate C-MW*, i.e., $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\mathrm{Co}}(\theta) > 0$ and $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\mathrm{Co}}(\theta) > \max_{j\neq i} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{w}}_j^{\mathrm{Co}}(\theta)$. In this case, the spectrum will still be allocated to the i-th independent contract user set with a degraded instantaneous welfare $\epsilon_i \cdot z_i(\theta) + \sum_{n=1}^{N} l_n^i \cdot (1-\tau_n)\cdot u_n(\theta)$. Thus, the welfare loss can be written as:

$$\psi_i(\theta) \triangleq (1-\epsilon_i)\cdot z_i(\theta).$$

(2) *The i'-th (with $i' \neq i$) independent contract user set has the highest and positive approximate C-MW*, i.e., $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{w}}_{i'}^{\mathrm{Co}}(\theta) > 0$ and $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{w}}_{i'}^{\mathrm{Co}}(\theta) > \max_{j\neq i'} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{w}}_j^{\mathrm{Co}}(\theta)$. In this case, the spectrum will be mistakenly allocated to the i'-th independent set instead with an instantaneous welfare $\epsilon_{i'} \cdot z_{i'}(\theta) + \sum_{n=1}^{N} l_n^{i'} \cdot (1-\tau_n)\cdot u_n(\theta)$. Thus, the welfare loss can be written as:

$$\psi_{i'}(\theta) \triangleq z_i(\theta) - \epsilon_{i'} \cdot z_{i'}(\theta) + \textstyle\sum_{n=1}^{N}(l_n^i - l_n^{i'})\cdot(1-\tau_n)\cdot u_n(\theta).$$

(3) *All independent contract user sets have the negative approximate C-MWs*, i.e., $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\mathrm{Co}}(\theta) < 0, \forall i = 1, ..., I_{\mathrm{C}}$. In this case, the spectrum will be mistakenly allocated to the spot market only with an instantaneous welfare $\epsilon_0 \cdot z_0(\theta)$. Thus, the welfare loss can be written as:

$$\psi_0(\theta) \triangleq z_i(\theta) - \epsilon_0 \cdot z_0(\theta) + \textstyle\sum_{n=1}^{N} l_n^i \cdot (1-\tau_n)\cdot u_n(\theta).$$

Denote $\mathbf{e}_i^i(\theta) \triangleq \{\epsilon \in \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \mid \widetilde{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\mathrm{Co}}(\theta) > 0 \ \&\ \widetilde{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\mathrm{Co}}(\theta) > \max_{j\neq i} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{w}}_j^{\mathrm{Co}}(\theta)\}$ as the set of performance ratio ϵ such that the i-th independent contract user set itself has the highest and positive approximate C-MW (i.e., case [1] mentioned above), $\mathbf{e}_i^{i'}(\theta) \triangleq \{\epsilon \in \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \mid \widetilde{\boldsymbol{w}}_{i'}^{\mathrm{Co}}(\theta) > 0 \ \&\ \widetilde{\boldsymbol{w}}_{i'}^{\mathrm{Co}}(\theta) > \max_{j\neq i'} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{w}}_j^{\mathrm{Co}}(\theta)\}$ as the set of ϵ such that the i'-th (where $i' \neq i$) independent contract user set has the highest and positive approximate C-MW (i.e., case [2] mentioned above), and $\mathbf{e}_i^0(\theta) \triangleq \{\epsilon \in \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \mid \widetilde{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\mathrm{Co}}(\theta) < 0, \forall i = 1, ..., I_{\mathrm{C}}\}$ as the set of ϵ such that all independent contract user sets have negative approximate C-MWs (i.e., case [3] mentioned above).[26] It is easy to see that $\bigcup_{j=0}^{I_{\mathrm{C}}} \mathbf{e}_i^j$ equals $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$, i.e., the whole range of ϵ. Here, the subscript and superscript in $\mathbf{e}_i^j(\theta)$ denote the indexes of allocated independent contract user sets under precise C-MWs and under approximate C-MWs, respectively. For convenience, we will omit the parameter θ in $\mathbf{e}_i^j(\theta)$, as long as there is no confusion caused.

Based on the above, the average welfare loss on every spectrum in $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_i$ is formally given by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\textstyle\int_{\theta\in\boldsymbol{\Theta}_i} \Big(\int_{\epsilon\in\mathbf{e}_i^i} \psi_i(\theta)\cdot f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}(\epsilon)\mathrm{d}\epsilon + \int_{\epsilon\in\mathbf{e}_i^0} \psi_0(\theta)\cdot f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}(\epsilon)\mathrm{d}\epsilon + \sum_{i'\neq i} \int_{\epsilon\in\mathbf{e}_i^{i'}} \psi_{i'}(\theta)\cdot f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}(\epsilon)\mathrm{d}\epsilon \Big)\cdot f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta)\mathrm{d}\theta \\
=&\textstyle\int_{\theta\in\boldsymbol{\Theta}_i} \Big(\int_{\epsilon\in\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \psi_i(\theta) f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}(\epsilon)\mathrm{d}\epsilon + \int_{\epsilon\in\mathbf{e}_i^0} \big(\psi_0(\theta) - \psi_i(\theta)\big) f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}(\epsilon)\mathrm{d}\epsilon + \sum_{i'\neq i} \int_{\epsilon\in\mathbf{e}_i^{i'}} \big(\psi_{i'}(\theta) - \psi_i(\theta)\big) f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}(\epsilon)\mathrm{d}\epsilon \Big) f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta)\mathrm{d}\theta \\
\leq&\textstyle\int_{\theta\in\boldsymbol{\Theta}_i} \Big((1-\bar{\epsilon}_i)\cdot z_i(\theta) - \int_{\epsilon\in\mathbf{e}_i^0} Y_i \cdot f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}(\epsilon)\mathrm{d}\epsilon + \sum_{i'\neq i} \int_{\epsilon\in\mathbf{e}_i^{i'}} (Y_{i'} - Y_i)\cdot f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}(\epsilon)\mathrm{d}\epsilon \Big)\cdot f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta)\mathrm{d}\theta \\
=&\textstyle\int_{\theta\in\boldsymbol{\Theta}_i} (1-\bar{\epsilon}_i)\cdot z_i(\theta)\cdot f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta)\mathrm{d}\theta - Y_i\cdot\beta_i^0 + \sum_{i'=1}^{I_{\mathrm{C}}} (Y_{i'} - Y_i)\cdot\beta_i^{i'},
\end{aligned}$$

where

[26] Similar to $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$, here we use the same notation $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ to denote the whole range of ϵ. For example, if ϵ_i is randomly drawn from $[0,1]$, then $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ is the Cartesian product of $I_{\mathrm{C}}+1$ intervals $[0,1]$.

- $\bar{\epsilon}_i = \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i] \triangleq \int_{\epsilon\in\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \epsilon_i f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}(\epsilon)\mathrm{d}\epsilon$ is the average performance ratio of the approximate MWIS algorithm in calculating $z_i(\theta)$, i.e., the expectation of random variable $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i$;
- $Y_i = \sum_{n=1}^{N} l_n^i \cdot X_n$ is the sum of X_n of all contract users in the i-th independent set, where $X_n \triangleq \widehat{P}_n - \lambda_n^*$ is a constant associated with contract user n only;
- $\int_{\epsilon\in\mathbf{e}_i^0} f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}(\epsilon)\mathrm{d}\epsilon$ is the probability of $\epsilon \in \mathbf{e}_i^0(\theta)$, i.e., the probability of mis-allocating a spectrum $\theta \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}_i$ to the 0-th independent contract user set (or the spot market only) under $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\mathrm{Co}}(\theta), \forall i$.
- $\beta_i^0 = \int_{\theta\in\boldsymbol{\Theta}_i}\int_{\epsilon\in\mathbf{e}_i^0} f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}(\epsilon) f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta)\mathrm{d}\epsilon\mathrm{d}\theta$ is the average mis-allocation probability of spectrums intended for the i-th independent contract user set to the 0-th one. That is, β_i^0 is the average probability of transferring spectrums from the i-th independent set to the 0-th one;
- $\int_{\epsilon\in\mathbf{e}_i^{i'}} f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}(\epsilon)\mathrm{d}\epsilon$ is the probability of $\epsilon \in \mathbf{e}_i^{i'}(\theta)$, i.e., the probability of mis-allocating a spectrum $\theta \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}_i$ to the i'-th independent set under approximate C-MWs $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\mathrm{Co}}(\theta), \forall i$.
- $\beta_i^{i'} = \int_{\theta\in\boldsymbol{\Theta}_i}\int_{\epsilon\in\mathbf{e}_i^{i'}} f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}(\epsilon) f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta)\mathrm{d}\epsilon\mathrm{d}\theta$ is the average mis-allocation probability of spectrum intended for the i-th independent contract user set to the i'-th one. That is, $\beta_i^{i'}$ is the average probability of transferring spectrums from the i-th independent set to the i'-th one;
- The inequality follows because: (i) $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\mathrm{Co}}(\theta) < 0$ if $\epsilon \in \mathbf{e}_i^0$, and $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\mathrm{Co}}(\theta) < \widetilde{\boldsymbol{w}}_{i'}^{\mathrm{Co}}(\theta)$ if $\epsilon \in \mathbf{e}_i^{i'}$; and (ii) $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\mathrm{Co}}(\theta) = \psi_0(\theta) - \psi_i(\theta) + Y_i$. Thus, we have: $\psi_0(\theta) - \psi_i(\theta) < -Y_i$, and $\psi_{i'}(\theta) - \psi_i(\theta) < Y_{i'} - Y_i$.

Thus, we can obtain an upper-bound of the expected welfare loss on every spectrum in $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_i$ as

$$\mathrm{Loss}^{(i)} \le \Phi_i - Y_i \cdot \beta_i^0 + \sum_{i'=1}^{I_{\mathrm{C}}} (Y_{i'} - Y_i) \cdot \beta_i^{i'}, \tag{34}$$

where $\Phi_i \triangleq \int_{\theta\in\boldsymbol{\Theta}_i} (1 - \bar{\epsilon}_i) \cdot z_i(\theta) f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta)\mathrm{d}\theta$ is the average side welfare loss of the i-th independent contract user set (over every spectrum in $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_i$).

7.2.2. Welfare Loss in $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_0$ Using a similar analysis to that in (34), we can obtain an upper-bound of the expected welfare loss on every spectrum in $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_0$ as:

$$\mathrm{Loss}^{(0)} \le \Phi_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{I_{\mathrm{C}}} Y_i \cdot \beta_0^i. \tag{35}$$

where $\Phi_0 \triangleq \int_{\theta\in\boldsymbol{\Theta}_0} (1 - \bar{\epsilon}_0) \cdot z_0(\theta) f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta)\mathrm{d}\theta$ is the average side welfare loss of the 0-th independent contract user set (over every spectrum in $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_0$), and $\beta_0^i = \int_{\theta\in\boldsymbol{\Theta}_0}\int_{\epsilon\in\mathbf{e}_0^i} f_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}(\epsilon) f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta)\mathrm{d}\epsilon\mathrm{d}\theta$ is the average probability of transferring spectrums from the 0-th independent contract user set to the i-th one.

By (34) and (35), the average welfare loss on every spectrum is bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=0}^{I_{\mathrm{C}}} \mathrm{Loss}^{(i)} &\le \sum_{i=0}^{I_{\mathrm{C}}} \Phi_i + \sum_{i=1}^{I_{\mathrm{C}}} \left(\sum_{i'=1}^{I_{\mathrm{C}}} (Y_{i'} - Y_i) \cdot \beta_i^{i'} - Y_i \cdot \beta_i^0 \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{I_{\mathrm{C}}} Y_i \cdot \beta_0^i \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{I_{\mathrm{C}}} \Phi_i + \sum_{i=1}^{I_{\mathrm{C}}} \left(\sum_{i'=1}^{I_{\mathrm{C}}} (Y_i \cdot \beta_{i'}^i - Y_i \cdot \beta_i^{i'}) - Y_i \cdot \beta_i^0 \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{I_{\mathrm{C}}} Y_i \cdot \beta_0^i \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{I_{\mathrm{C}}} \Phi_i - \sum_{i=1}^{I_{\mathrm{C}}} Y_i \cdot \Delta_i \triangleq \sum_{i=0}^{I_{\mathrm{C}}} \Phi_i - \sum_{n=1}^{N} X_n \cdot \gamma_n,
\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

where

- $\Delta_i \triangleq \sum_{i'=1}^{I_{\mathrm{C}}} \beta_i^{i'} + \beta_i^0 - \sum_{i'=1}^{I_{\mathrm{C}}} \beta_{i'}^i - \beta_0^i$ is the *change* on average allocation probability of a spectrum to the i-th independent contract user set, in which the first two terms denote the allocation

probability decrease (induced by mis-allocating the spectrums intended for the i-th independent set to others), and the last two terms denote the allocation probability increase;

- $\gamma_n \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^{I_C} l_n^i \cdot \Delta_i$ is the *change* on average allocation probability of a spectrum to contract user n, which is the sum of the probability changes of all related independent sets;
- The second line follows because $\sum_{i=1}^{I_C}\sum_{i'=1}^{I_C} Y_{i'}\beta_i^{i'} = \sum_{i'=1}^{I_C}\sum_{i=1}^{I_C} Y_i\beta_{i'}^{i}$ by exchanging the indices of two summing operations, and the last line follows because $Y_i = \sum_{n=1}^{N} l_n^i \cdot X_n$.

7.2.3. Welfare Loss by Spectrum Under-Allocation It is important to note that the welfare loss in (36) is induced by the **non-optimal utilization** of spectrum due to the mis-allocation, without including the potential welfare loss of contract users (defined in Eq. [8]) induced by the spectrum **under-allocation** due to the mis-allocation.

Now we study the welfare loss of contract users induced by the spectrum under-allocation. From (8) we can easily find that such a potential welfare loss is determined by the expected number of spectrums that each contract user obtains. By Lemma 2, none of the contract users can obtain spectrums more than his or her demand. Thus, any negative change on a contract user n's average allocation probability γ_n would impose certain welfare loss for contract user n, while any positive change on γ_n may or may not bring welfare gain for contract user n (depending on whether the contract user already obtained the demanded spectrums). Formally, the average welfare loss induced by the spectrum under-allocation (over every spectrum) is bounded by:

$$\textsc{Loss}^{\textsc{WL}} \leq \sum_{n=1}^{N} \widehat{P}_n \cdot \left[\sum_{i=1}^{I_C} l_n^i \cdot \Delta_i\right]^+ = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \widehat{P}_n \cdot \left[\gamma_n\right]^+. \tag{37}$$

7.2.4. Overall Welfare Loss Combining (36) and (37), the expected overall welfare loss on every spectrum is bounded by:

$$\begin{aligned}\textsc{Loss}^{\textsc{All}} &= \sum_{i=0}^{I_C} \textsc{Loss}^{(i)} + \textsc{Loss}^{\textsc{WL}} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{I_C} \Phi_i - \sum_{n=1}^{N} X_n \cdot \gamma_n + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \widehat{P}_n \cdot [\gamma_n]^+ \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{I_C} (1-\bar{\epsilon}_i) \cdot \mathbb{E}[Z_i]^* - \sum_{n=1}^{N} X_n \cdot \gamma_n + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \widehat{P}_n \cdot [\gamma_n]^+,\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

where $\mathbb{E}[Z_i]^* \triangleq \int_{\theta\in\mathbf{\Theta}_i} z_i(\theta) f_{\mathbf{\Theta}}(\theta) \mathrm{d}\theta$. Since $\mathbb{E}[Z_i]^* = \frac{1}{\rho\cdot S} \cdot \mathbb{E}[W_i^{\textsc{S}}]^*$, where $\mathbb{E}[W_i^{\textsc{S}}]^*$ is the expected side welfare of the i-th independent set over all S spectrums (defined in Eq. [22]) under the optimal allocation, $\mathbb{E}[Z_i]^*$ represents the expected side welfare of the i-th independent set over every spectrum.

7.2.5. Achievable Performance Ratio Let $\bar{\epsilon} \triangleq \min_i \bar{\epsilon}_i$ denote the minimum expected performance ratio of all MWIS algorithms applied. Subtracting the overall welfare loss from the optimal welfare (defined in Eq. [24]), we have the following average achievable welfare

$$\begin{aligned}&\textsc{Wf}^{\textsc{Achi}} = \textsc{Wf}^{\textsc{Opt}} - \rho S \cdot \textsc{Loss}^{\textsc{All}} \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{I_C} \mathbb{E}[W_i^{\textsc{S}}]^* + \sum_{n=1}^{N} (\tau_n \mathbb{E}[w_n^{\textsc{C}}]^* + (1-\tau_n)\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{w}_n^{\textsc{C}}]^*) - \rho S \cdot \textsc{Loss}^{\textsc{All}} \\ &\geq \sum_{i=0}^{I_C} \bar{\epsilon} \cdot \mathbb{E}[W_i^{\textsc{S}}]^* + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left(\tau_n \mathbb{E}[w_n^{\textsc{C}}]^* + (1-\tau_n)\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{w}_n^{\textsc{C}}]^*\right) + \rho S \cdot \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left(X_n\gamma_n - \widehat{P}_n\left[\gamma_n\right]^+\right),\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

where $\rho S \cdot \text{Loss}^{\text{All}}$ is the overall welfare loss over all S spectrums, and $\text{Wf}^{\text{Opt}} \triangleq \mathbb{E}[W]^* = \sum_{i=0}^{I_C} \mathbb{E}[W_i^S]^* + \sum_{n=1}^{N} (\tau_n \mathbb{E}[w_n^C]^* + (1-\tau_n)\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{w}_n^C]^*)$ is the overall welfare (spectrum efficiency) under the optimal allocation (using precise C-MWs), wherein $(\tau_n \mathbb{E}[w_n^C]^* + (1-\tau_n)\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{w}_n^C]^*)$ is the expected welfare of the contract user n under the optimal allocation. Note that $\rho S \cdot \gamma_n$ is the negative change of the expected number of spectrums allocated to contract user n.

Let us elaborate on the insights behind (39). First, there is a welfare loss ratio $(1-\bar{\epsilon})$ on the spot market (either the whole spot market, or the side spot market of a particular independent contract user set), shown by the first term in (39). This welfare loss ratio is the same as the performance loss ratio of the adopted approximate MWIS algorithm. Second, there is an average welfare loss $t_n \triangleq X_n \cdot \gamma_n - \widehat{P}_n \cdot [\gamma_n]^+$ for each contract user n. Obviously, if $\gamma_n > 0$, which implies that the number of spectrums for contract user n is decreased (under approximate C-MWs), we have: $t_n = X_n \cdot \gamma_n - \widehat{P}_n \cdot \gamma_n = -\lambda_n^* \cdot \gamma_n \leq 0$; and if $\gamma_n < 0$, which implies the number of spectrum for contract user n is increased (under approximate C-MWs), we also have: $t_n = X_n \cdot \gamma_n < 0$.

Finally, we have the following bound for the relative welfare ratio (WR):

$$\text{WR} = \frac{\text{Wf}^{\text{Achi}}}{\text{Wf}^{\text{Opt}}} \geq \bar{\epsilon} + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{(1-\bar{\epsilon}) \cdot \left(\tau_n \mathbb{E}[w_n^C]^* + (1-\tau_n)\mathbb{E}[\widetilde{w}_n^C]^*\right) + \rho S \cdot t_n}{\mathbb{E}[W]^*}. \tag{40}$$

Note that the above discussion concerns the theoretical *lower-bound* of the achieved performance ratio. Even if this bound is poor, the actual welfare may still be maintained at a good level. We will show by our simulation results (Figs. 7 and 8) that even with the worst MWIS algorithm in our simulations, the actual welfare ratio is more than 70%; whereas, the theoretical bound is lower than $\bar{\epsilon}$ (i.e., 50%). Furthermore, in our technical report, Gao et al. (2012b), we will show that the above welfare ratio is asymptotically tight.

8. Simulation Results

We perform simulations in MATLAB. Unless otherwise stated, we will use the following default setting: (i) all spot market SUs are randomly distributed in a square area with 1000m×1000m; (ii) all contract SUs are placed on some predetermined locations in the square area; and (iii) all SUs' utilities are uniformly distributed in $[0,1]$, i.e., $F_{\boldsymbol{v}_m}(x) = F_{\boldsymbol{u}_n}(x) = x, \forall x \in [0,1]$. Let IRs and IRc denote the interference ranges of the spot market users and contract users, respectively.

8.1. Optimal Social Welfare $\mathbb{E}[W]^*$

Fig. 5 presents a realization of the random network topology with 20 randomly distributed spot market users and 3 contract users located at (300m, 400m), (500m, 600m) and (700m, 400m), respectively. The interference range of spot market users is IRs = 300m. The ellipses denote different values of IRc, i.e., the interference range of contract users. Given a particular IRc, the spot market users outside the ellipse(s) of a contract user (set) form the corresponding side market. The edges



Figure 5 Network topology.



Figure 6 Expected social welfare.

between contract users denote their interference relationships under a certain IRc (e.g., when IRc=300m). In Fig. 5's example, contract users 1 and 2 (or 2 and 3) interfere with each other, while contract users 1 and 3 do not. Therefore, there are totally four independent contract user sets: {1}, {2}, {3}, and {1, 3}.

Fig. 6 presents the expected social welfare *vs* IRc under different allocation strategies. Note that each value in the figure is the average of 1,000 simulations, and each simulation corresponds to a particular realization of the random network topology. The dashed line denotes the maximum expected social welfare *without* the futures market (benchmark), which is achieved by optimally allocating each spectrum to the spot market (i.e., to an MWIS of the spot market). Obviously, this benchmark is independent of the interference range of contract users (IRc). The upper red curve (with mark "◯") denotes the maximum expected social welfare under the optimal allocation strategy proposed in this work. The lower three blue curves denote the expected social welfares under allocation strategies "Contract-Last and Spot-Best" (with mark "△"), "Contract-Random and Spot-Best" (with mark "□"), and "Contract-Last and Spot-Best" (with mark "▽"), respectively. Under the "Contract-Last/Random/First and Spot-Best" strategies, the PR allocates $\mathbb{E}[D_n]$ spectrums with the lowest, arbitrary, and highest utilities to each contract user n, respectively. Here, $\mathbb{E}[D_n]$ is the expected number of spectrum contract user n achieves under the optimal allocation (derived in our paper). The green curve (with mark "+") denotes the expected social welfare under such an allocation strategy that randomly allocates D_n (i.e., the demand of contract user n) spectrums to each contract user n, called "Contract-Random (D_n) and Spot-Best". Note that under all of the above four strategies, when a spectrum is allocated to a contract user (or a set of independent contract users) in the futures market, it will also be allocated to an MWIS of the associated side (spot) market at the same time. This is the reason that we call them "Spot-Best".

Fig. 6 shows that our proposed optimal allocation strategy outperforms other strategies significantly. The maximum expected social welfare under the proposed optimal strategy is on aver-

age 20% higher than that under "Contract-Random (D_n) and Spot-Best". This performance gap becomes even larger with more contract users. Moreover, the performances under "Contract-First/Random/Last and Spot-Best" are very close to each other. This is because different SUs' utilities for the same spectrum are independent of each other; hence, a spectrum that brings a high or low utility for a contract user may not bring high or low utilities for spot market users. When IRc is small, the performance under "Contract-Last and Spot-Best" is a bit higher than that under "Contract-Random and Spot-Best", which is further a bit higher than that under "Contract-First and Spot-Best". This is because allocating a spectrum to a spot market user can generate a higher utilization-based welfare than allocating a spectrum (with the same utility) to a contract user (as the latter is discounted by τ). When IRc is large, the performances under "Contract-First/Random/Last and Spot-Best" are identical, and they converge to the maximum expected social welfare achieved in the proposed optimal allocation. This is because $\mathbb{E}[D_n] \to 0$ in this case; thus, all spectrums are optimally allocated to the spot market as in our proposed optimal allocation. Notice that this maximum expected social welfare is less than the benchmark (without the futures market), due to the penalties of contract users. Finally, the performance under "Contract-Random (D_n) and Spot-Best" is same as that under "Contract-Random and Spot-Best" when IRc is small; whereas, it is worse than that under "Contract-Random and Spot-Best" when IRc is large. This reason is as follows. When IRc is small, $\mathbb{E}[D_n] = D_n$ (i.e., the contract user demand is fully satisfied) due to the weak conflict between spot market users and contract users); when IRc is large, $\mathbb{E}[D_n] \to 0$ due to the severe conflict between spot market users and contract users.

Fig. 6 further shows that the maximum expected social welfare with the futures market (under the proposed optimal strategy) may be smaller than the maximum expected social welfare without the futures market (benchmark), when, for example, IRc is large. That is, accepting contract users in the futures market may reduce the total achieved social welfare, compared to that under a pure spot market. Notice that this welfare gap can serve as a guidance used to decide whether or not to accept futures contracts prior to the spectrum allocation optimization considered in this work. For example, in this figure, it is more efficient to accept futures contracts when IRc is smaller than 0.2, while it is more efficient in a pure spot market when Irc is larger than 0.2. The reason that a hybrid market is worse than a pure spot market is as follows. When accepting contracts in the futures market, we can gain certain welfare from the futures market, but lose certain welfare from the spot market, due to the reduction of spectrum allocated to the spot market. When IRc is small, the welfare loss in the spot market is smaller than the welfare gain in the futures market, since the futures market interferes slightly with the spot market. However, when IRc is large, the welfare loss in the spot market may be larger than the welfare gain in the futures market, since the futures market interferes greatly with the spot market.


Achieved WR:
IRs = 100m and IRc inceasing
from 100m to 500m
Analytical WR Bound:
IRs = 100m and IRc inceasing
from 100m to 500m
Average Welfare Ratio (WR)
Average Performance Ratio of the MWIS Algorithms - $\bar{\epsilon}$

Figure 7 The achieved WR and analytical WR bound with IRs=100m.


Achieved WR:
IRs = 300m and IRc inceasing
from 100m to 500m
Analytical WR Bound:
IRs = 300m and IRc inceasing
from 100m to 500m
Average Welfare Ratio (WR)
Average Performance Ratio of the MWIS Algorithms - $\bar{\epsilon}$

Figure 8 The achieved WR and analytical WR bound with IRs=300m.

8.2. Welfare Loss by Approximate MWIS Algorithms

Now we study the welfare loss and the relative welfare ratio (WR) under the approximate MWIS algorithms. We take the performance ratio of the adopted approximate MWIS algorithm as a random variable ϵ drawn from $[e_0, 1]$ uniformly and independently, where $e_0 \in [0, 1]$. Accordingly, the average performance ratio is $\bar{\epsilon} = \frac{1}{2}(1 + e_0)$.

Figs. 7 and 8 present the achieved WR and the analytical WR bound given in (40) under different approximate MWIS algorithms (with different average performance ratio $\bar{\epsilon}$). The upper (red) five curves denote the achieved WR when IRc increases from 100m to 500m, and the lower (blue) five curves denote the analytical WR bounds when IRc increases from 100m to 500m. From Figs. 7 and 8 we can see that WR decreases with IRc. This is because a larger IRc means a smaller side welfare $z_i(\theta)$ for each independent contract user set $\mathcal{I}_i^{\mathrm{C}}$, and the side welfare $z_0(\theta)$ becomes relatively more significant. Thus, the C-MW $\dot{\boldsymbol{w}}_i^{\mathrm{Co}}(\theta)$ defined in Definition 8 is mainly determined by $z_0(\theta)$, and the welfare loss is mainly due to the degradation of $z_0(\theta)$. Additionally, with certain degradation of $z_0(\theta)$, the spectrum intended for the 0-th independent contract user set (i.e., the spot market only) may be mis-allocated to another independent set (e.g., the i-th one) with a welfare loss $z_0(\theta) - \epsilon_i \cdot z_i(\theta) + \sum_{n=1}^{N} l_n^i (1 - \tau_n) u_n(\theta)$. Obviously, the smaller the side welfare $z_i(\theta)$, the higher the possible welfare loss. We can also see that the gap between the relative WR (either the achieved WR or the analytical WR bound) under different values of IRc becomes smaller, when IRs becomes larger. For example, when IRs=100m (in Fig. 7), the gap between the achieved WR under IRc=100m and IRc=300m is $80\% - 70\% = 10\%$ (in the worst case $\bar{\epsilon} = 0.5$); while when IRs = 500m (in Fig. 8), this gap is only $78\% - 72\% = 6\%$. This is because a larger IRs implies a lower level of $z_i(\theta)$; thus, the impact of IRc on $z_i(\theta)$ becomes less significant on the C-MWs.

Figs. 7 and 8 show that even with the worst approximate MWIS algorithm in our simulations (i.e., $\bar{\epsilon} = 0.5$ when ϵ drawn from $[0, 1]$), the achieved social welfare can reach more than 70% of the

optimal social welfare. This implies that the optimal allocation (policy) proposed in this work is robust to the performance degradation of the approximate MWIS algorithms. We will further show in our technical report, Gao et al. (2012b), that the above welfare ratio bound is asymptotically tight, in the sense that there does not exist another bound that is *always* better than our proposed one in any case.

9. Conclusion

We study the short-term secondary spectrum trading in a hybrid spectrum market, and focus on the spectrum efficiency maximization with spatial spectrum reuse under stochastic and asymmetric information. We first compute an off-line optimal policy that specifies the allocation of any spectrum under every possible information realization, and then design an on-line VCG auction that elicits SUs' private information and determines the real allocation of every spectrum. Such a solution technique allows us to optimally allocate every spectrum in an on-line manner, based on the policy derived and the information elicited. We further propose a heuristics solution based on a low complexity VCG-like mechanism, and quantify the associated spectrum efficiency loss.

We would like to point out that the problem considered in this work (i.e., spectrum allocation in an exogenous hybrid market in which every SU is associated and fixed in a particular market) can be viewed as a sub-problem of the whole market optimization problem, which consists of both the hybrid market formulation and the spectrum allocation. Our analysis of spectrum allocation in a given market provides a very important first step towards the "social optimal design" for the whole model. In our future work, we will study the problem of joint market formulation and spectrum allocation, in which every SU can make strategic decisions about the market selection, and can further negotiate with the PR for the contract details if choosing the futures market.

References

Abhishek, V., Ian A. Kash, and Peter Key. 2012. Fixed and market price for cloud services. *7th Workshop on the Economics of Networks, Systems, and Computation (NetEcon)*.

Akyildiz, I. F., W. Y. Lee, et al. 2006. Next Generation/Dynamic Spectrum Access/Cognitive Radio Wireless Networks: A Survey. *Computer Networks* 50(13):2127–2159.

Buddhikot, M. M. 2007. Understanding Dynamic Spectrum Access: Models, Taxonomy and Challenges. *Proc. of IEEE DySPAN*.

Dantzig, G. B. 1998. *Linear Programming and Extensions*. Princeton University Press.

de Kok, A. G. and S. C. Graves. 2003. *Supply Chain Management: Design, Coordination and Operation*. Amsterdam (Elsevier).

Duan, L., L. Gao, and J. Huang. 2011. Contract-Based Cooperative Spectrum Sharing. *Proc. IEEE DySPAN*.

Fattorini, H. O. 1999. *Infinite Dimensional Optimization and Control Theory*. Cambridge University Press.

FCC. 2002. Report of the Spectrum Efficiency Group. *FCC Spectrum Policy Task Force*.

FCC. 2010. Second Memorandum Opinion and Order (FCC 10-174). *FCC Spectrum Policy Task Force*.

Gandhi, S., C. Buragohain, L. Cao, et al. 2007. A General Framework for Wireless Spectrum Auctions. *Proc. IEEE DySPAN*.

Gao, L., X. Wang, Y. Xu, and Q. Zhang. 2010. Spectrum Trading in Cognitive Radio Networks: A Contract-Theoretic Modeling Approach. *IEEE J. Selected Areas in Comm.* 29(4):843–855.

Gao, L., J. Huang, Y. Chen, and B. Shou. 2012a. An Integrated Contract and Auction Design for Secondary Spectrum Trading. *IEEE J. Selected Areas in Comm.* 31(3):581–592.

Gao, L., J. Huang, Y. Chen, and B. Shou. 2012b. Combining Spot and Futures Markets: A Hybrid Market Approach to Dynamic Spectrum Access. Online Technical Report, url: http://arxiv.org/abs/1405.7175

Gupta, P. and P. R. Kumar. 2000. The Capacity of Wireless Networks. *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory* 46(2):388–404.

Haykin, S. 2005. Cognitive Radio: Brain-Empowered Wireless Communications. *IEEE J. Selected Areas in Comm.* 23(2) 201–220.

Hossain, E., D. Niyato, and Z. Han. 2009. *Dynamic Spectrum Access and Management in Cognitive Radio Networks.* Cambridge University Press.

Huang, J., R. Berry, and M. L. Honig. 2006. Auction-Based Spectrum Sharing. *ACM Mobile Networks and App. J.* 11(3):405–418.

IEEE. 2011. IEEE 802.22TM-2011 Standard for Wireless Regional Area Networks in TV White Spaces Completed. Online at: http://standards.ieee.org/news/2011/802.22.html

Kalathil, D. M. and R. Jain. 2010. Spectrum Sharing Through Contracts. *Proc. IEEE DySPAN.*

Kasbekar, G., S. Sarkar, et al. 2010. Dynamic Contract Trading in Spectrum Markets. *Proc. IEEE Allerton.*

Kleindorfer, P. R. and D. J. Wu. 2003. Integrating Long- and Short-Term Contracting via Business-to-Business Exchanges for Capital-Intensive Industries. *Management Science* 49(11):1597–1615.

Kleindorfer, P. R. 2008a. Integrating Physical and Financial Risk Management in Supply Management. Book chapter in *Risk Management for Commodity Markets* by H. Geman.

Kleindorfer, P. R. 2008b. Hedging Commodity Risks in Supply Management. Note for *Encyclopedia of Quantitative Finance* edited by Rama Cont, forthcoming from J. Wiley & Sons, New York.

Kloeck, C., H. Jaekel, and F. K. Jondral. 2005. Dynamic and Local Combined Pricing, Allocation and Billing System with Cognitive Radios. *Proc. IEEE DySPAN.*

Kolb, R. W. and J. A. Overdahl. 2007. *Futures, options, and swaps.* Wiley-Blackwell Press.

Kouvelis, P., R. Li, and Q. Ding. 2009. Inventory Management and Financial Hedging of Storable Commodities. Working Paper. Lee Kong Chian School of Business.

Krishna, V. 2009. *Auction theory.* Academic Press.

Lee, H. and S. Whang. 2002. the Impact of the Secondary Market on the Supply Chain. *Management Science* 48(6) 719–731.

Li, X., P. Xu, S. Tang, et al. 2008. Spectrum Bidding in Wireless Networks and Related. *Proc. of COCOON.*

McHenry, M. A., P. A. Tenhula, et al. 2006. Chicago Spectrum Occupancy Measurements & Analysis and a Long-Term Studies Proposal. *Proc. ACM TAPAS.*

Munkres, J. 1957. Algorithms for the Assignment and Transportation Problems. *Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics* 5(1):32–38.

Muthusamy, P. K. Kar, A. Gupta, S. Sarkar, and G. Kasbekar. 2011. Portfolio Optimization in Secondary Spectrum Markets. *Proc. IEEE WiOpt.*

Myerson, R. B. 1981. Optimal Auction Design. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 6(1):58–73.

NAB/MSTV. 2009. Broadcasters Sue FCC Over White Space Broadband Decision. Online at: http://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/news/2009/03/broadcasters-sue-fcc-over-white-space-broadband-decision.ars

Nisan, N. 2007. *Algorithmic Game Theory.* Cambridge University Press.

Niyato, D. and E. Hossain. 2008. Market-Equilibrium, Competitive, and Cooperative Pricing for Spectrumsharing in Cognitive Radio Networks: Analysis and Comparison. *IEEE Trans. Wireless Comm.*

Peleg, B., H. L. and Lee, W. H. Hausman. 2002. Short-Term E-Procurement Strategies Versus Longterm Contracts. *Production and Operations Management* 11(4):458–479.

Shannon, C. E. 2001. A Mathematical Theory of Communication. *ACM SIGMOBILE Mobile Computing and Communications Review* 5(1):3–55.

Tonmukayakul, A. and M. B. H. Weiss. 2009. A Study of Secondary Spectrum Use Using Agent-Based Computational Economics. *Economic Research and Electronic Networking* 9(2):125–151.

Tse, D. and P. Viswanath. 2005. *Fundamentals of Wireless Communication.* Cambridge University Press.

Wang, F., M. Krunz, and S. Cui. 2008. Price-Based Spectrum Management in Cognitive Radio Networks. *IEEE J. Selected Topics Signal Proc.* 2(1):74–87.

Wang, S., P. Xu, X. Xu, et al. 2010. TODA: Truthful Online Double Auction for Spectrum Allocation in Wireless Networks. *Proc. IEEE DySPAN.*

West, D. B. 2001. *Introduction To Graph Theory.* Prentice Hall Upper Saddle River Press.

Wu, D. J. and P. R. Kleindorfer. 2005. Competitive Options, Supply Contracting, and Electronic Markets. *Management Science* 51(3):452–466.

Yi, J. and A. Scheller-Wolf. 2003. Dual Sourcing from A Regular Supplier and A Spot Market, Working Paper. GSIA, Carnegie Mellon University.

Zhao, Q. and B. M. Sadler. 2007. A Survey of Dynamic Spectrum Access: Signal Processing, Networking, and Regulatory Policy. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine* 24(4):79–89.

Zhou, X., S. Gandhi, S. Suri, and H. Zheng. 2008. eBay in the Sky: Strategy-Proof Wireless Spectrum Auctions. *Proc. ACM MobiCom.*

Zhou, X. and H. Zheng. 2009. TRUST: A General Framework for Truthful Double Spectrum Auctions. *Proc. IEEE INFOCOM.*

10. Appendix

Technical Report

Title: Combining Spot and Futures Markets: A Hybrid Market Approach to Dynamic Spectrum Access

Authors: Lin Gao, Jianwei Huang, Ying-Ju Chen, and Biying Shou

Note: The original version is submitted to INFORMS Operations Research.

Outline of This Technical Report

- 10.1. Truthful Revelation of SU Demand Type
- 10.2. Impact of Expected Contract Demand
- 10.3. Tightness of Welfare Ratio Bound
- 10.4. Some Necessary Conditions for SIC
- 10.6. Proof for Proposition 1
- 10.7. Proof for Proposition 2
- 10.8. Proof for Lemma 1
- 10.9. Proof for Lemma 2
- 10.10. Proof for Corollary 1
- 10.11. Proof for Lemma 3
- 10.12. Proof for Lemma 4
- 10.13. Proof for Lemma 5
- 10.14. Proof for Lemma 6

10.1. Truthful Revelation of SU Demand Type

We first elaborate on an SU's demand type (elastic or inelastic), which mainly depends on the QoS requirement of the associated application/service. For example, applications, such as FTP downloading, data backup, and cloud synchronization have elastic demand for spectrum, in the sense that the tasks are not urgent in terms of time. Thus, the QoS will not be significantly affected, even if the spectrum resource is limited and the transmission rate is low for a substantial amount of time. On the other hand, applications, such as VoIP, video streaming, and real-time data collection have inelastic demand for spectrum. In other words, they can only function well when the data rate is guaranteed to be above certain thresholds such that the delay requirements are met, otherwise they will suffer significant performance loss. It is important to note that the information of application type is usually explicitly represented in the headers of data packets, and can be easily extracted by the network operators through deep packet inspection. Hence, it is reasonable to assume that SUs cannot fake their application types arbitrarily.

We further note that even if an SU has the capability of faking his or her application type, he or she does not have the incentive to do so if the hybrid market is properly designed. Specifically, the futures market insures SUs against uncertainties of future spectrum acquisition through pre-defined contracts; whereas, the spot market allows SUs to compete for spectrum based on their real-time demands and preferences. Therefore, with a proper design of the contracts in the futures market, a rational SU with elastic demand will generally prefer spot transactions to achieve the flexible resource-price tradeoff. In contrast, a rational SU with inelastic demand requiring minimum data rates will prefer the certainty of contract in the futures market.

For example, consider an SU n with an inelastic demand D_n, a fixed total welfare B_n (when the demand is satisfied), and a potential welfare loss scheme $\mathbf{J}_n$ (when the demand is not satisfied). Suppose the PR offers the following contract: $\textsc{Ctr}_n = \{\widetilde{B}_n, D_n, \mathbf{J}_n\}$. Then the SU's surplus when choosing such a contract is:[27]

$$S_n^{\text{F}} = B_n - \widetilde{B}_n.$$

On the other hand, when SU n chooses the spot market, the expected surplus is:

$$S_n^{\text{S}} = B_n - Loss(D_n - \bar{d}_n) - \bar{d}_n \cdot \bar{p}_n,$$

where $\bar{d}_n$ is the average number of spectrum obtained through the spot market, and $\bar{p}_n$ is the average payment for every spectrum. As long as the welfare loss $Loss(D_n - \bar{d}_n)$ is sufficiently large, the SU will bid in such a way that the achieved demand $\bar{d}_n$ equals the required demand D_n. Thus, the expected surplus under such a bidding strategy in the spot market is:

$$S_n^{\text{S}} = B_n - D_n \cdot \bar{p}_n,$$

where $\bar{p}_n$ is the average payment for every spectrum. By comparing the SU's surpluses in both market markets, we can easily find that if the payment specified in the contract is no larger than the actual payment in the spot market (i.e., $\widetilde{B}_n \leq D_n \cdot \bar{p}_n$), the SU can achieve a larger surplus from the contract in the futures market. Note that such a contract design is also desirable by a social-planning spectrum regulator, as truth-telling of SU is the prerequisite for the spectrum utilization maximization.

Similarly, consider another example in which SU n has the elastic demand. When choosing the spot market, he or she bids truthfully (under our proposed auction mechanism) and achieves an expected surplus:

$$S_n^{\text{S}} = \bar{d}_n \cdot (\bar{w}_n - \bar{p}_n).$$

[27] Here, we suppose that the SU's welfare loss due to the unmet demand is exactly compensated by the penalty $\mathbf{J}_n$ specified in the contract.

Here, $\bar{d}_n$ is the average number of spectrum obtained through the spot market, $\bar{p}_n$ is the average payment for every spectrum, and $\bar{w}_n$ is the average welfare achieved from every spectrum. Suppose that the PR offers the following contract $\text{CTR}_n = \{\widetilde{B}_n, D_n, \mathbf{J}_n\}$, where $D_n = \bar{d}_n$. When choosing the contract, the SU's expected surplus is:

$$S_n^{\text{F}} = \widetilde{d}_n \cdot \widetilde{w}_n + Penalty(D_n, \widetilde{d}_n) - \widetilde{B}_n,$$

where $\widetilde{d}_n \leq D_n$ is the average number of spectrum obtained through the contract, and $\widetilde{p}_n$ is the average welfare achieved from every spectrum. We further suppose that the penalty is defined in the following way: $Penalty(D_n, \widetilde{d}_n) = (D_n - \widetilde{d}_n) \cdot \frac{\widetilde{B}_n}{D_n}$, where $\frac{\widetilde{B}_n}{D_n}$ is the average payment for every spectrum. That is, the PR will pay back all of the unmet demand to the SU. Then, the SU's expected surplus when choosing the contract is:

$$S_n^{\text{F}} = \widetilde{d}_n \cdot \widetilde{w}_n - \widetilde{d}_n \cdot \frac{\widetilde{B}_n}{D_n}.$$

Notice that $\widetilde{d}_n \leq D_n = \bar{d}_n$ and $\widetilde{w}_n \leq \bar{w}_n$ (as the SU is more likely to obtain the high welfare spectrum through the auction). Thus, if the average payment in the contract is no smaller than the average payment in the spot market, i.e., $\frac{\widetilde{B}_n}{D_n} \geq \bar{p}_n$, the SU can achieve a larger surplus from spot market.

From the above discussions, we show that through a proper design of contracts in the futures market, we can prevent an SU with inelastic demand from choosing the spot market, and an SU with elastic demand from choosing the futures market. Nevertheless, how to fully characterize the future contract such that any SU will truthfully reveal his or her demand type and any other required parameters (such as the demand/welfare loss of an SU with inelastic demand, or the average number of spectrum achieved in the spot market for an SU with elastic demand) is a challenging problem in general. Thus, to maintain analytical tractability, in this paper we focus on the optimal spectrum allocation problem in an *exogenously given* hybrid market, in which all SUs are assumed to truthfully reveal their demand types (market selections). In other words, the spot market and the futures market are already given and fixed.

10.2. Impact of Expected Contract Demand

In our model, we assume that a contract user cares about the expected number of spectrum (reflecting the expected data rate) that he or she will obtain, while not the strict number of spectrum (reflecting the strict data rate). The key reason for this assumption is as follows.

The main practical motivation for such an assumption is that most wireless applications in practice require an *expected/average* data rate during a certain time period, while only very few applications is required to satisfy a *strict* data rate constraint at all times. For example, video streaming concerns the average downloading rate in every minute, and VoIP concerns the average downloading/uploading rate in every second. When the actual data rate is occasionally less than

the average rate, various coding and error concealment technologies can be employed so that the end-users will not feel significant performance degradation. Thus, with a proper choice of the length of allocation period (e.g., 1 minute for video streaming, or 1 second for VoIP), such a contract formulation (with the expected spectrum demand) is suitable for most wireless applications. In fact, with the uncertainties of spectrum availability and SU utility for each spectrum, it is practically impossible to guarantee a strict spectrum supply for each contract user. To our knowledge, no such guarantee has been provided even in the latest communication standard.

To make our analysis more complete, we also provide the detailed theoretical evaluation for the impact of this assumption on the achieved performance. That is, we evaluate the potential welfare loss induced by this assumption, i.e., the gap between the maximum social welfare under the expected contract demand and under the strict contract demand. The key idea and details are given as follows. First, we denote W_{E} as the expected social welfare computed by the expected contract demand, and $\boldsymbol{A}_{\text{E}}^*$ as the optimal allocation that maximizes the expected social welfare W_{E} (i.e., those studied in this paper). That is:

$$\boldsymbol{A}_{\text{E}}^* = \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{A}} \ W_{\text{E}}(\boldsymbol{A}).$$

Similarly, we denote W_{S} as the strict social welfare computed by the strict contract demand, and $\boldsymbol{A}_{\text{S}}^*$ as the optimal allocation that maximizes the strict social welfare W_{S}. That is:

$$\boldsymbol{A}_{\text{S}}^* = \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{A}} \ W_{\text{S}}(\boldsymbol{A}).$$

Then, using basic optimization principles, we have the following observation:

$$W_{\text{E}}^* \geq W_{\text{S}}^* \geq W_{\text{S}}(\boldsymbol{A}_{\text{E}}^*),$$

where $W_{\text{E}}^* \triangleq W_{\text{E}}(\boldsymbol{A}_{\text{E}}^*)$ is the maximum social welfare under the expected contract demand constraint, and $W_{\text{S}}^* \triangleq W_{\text{S}}(\boldsymbol{A}_{\text{S}}^*)$ is the maximum strict social welfare under the strict contract demand constraint. The first inequality follows because the expected contract demand constraint is looser than the strict contract demand constraint; hence, the maximum social welfare W_{S}^* under the strict contract demand constraint is upper-bounded by the maximum social welfare W_{E}^* under the expected contract demand constraint. The second inequality follows because $\boldsymbol{A}_{\text{S}}^*$ is the optimal allocation that maximizes W_{S}; hence, $W_{\text{S}}^* = W_{\text{S}}(\boldsymbol{A}_{\text{S}}^*)$ must be no smaller than $W_{\text{S}}^*(\boldsymbol{A}_{\text{E}}^*)$.

The above observation further implies that the gap between W_{E}^* and W_{S}^* is bounded by the gap between W_{E}^* and $W_{\text{S}}(\boldsymbol{A}_{\text{E}}^*)$. That is:

$$W_{\text{E}}^* - W_{\text{S}}^* \geq W_{\text{E}}^* - W_{\text{S}}(\boldsymbol{A}_{\text{E}}^*).$$

The above formula implies that we can use the gap W_{E}^* and $W_{\text{S}}(\boldsymbol{A}_{\text{E}}^*)$ to characterize an effective upper-bound of the gap between W_{E}^* and W_{S}^*. Note that it is difficult to compute the maximum


Social Welfare
Time period − T
Maximum Expected Social Welfare W_E*
Strict Social Welfare W_S under A_E*
Social Welfare Ratio
Time period − T

Figure 9 (a) The maximum expected social welfare $W_{\rm E}^*$ and the strict social welfare $W_{\rm S}(\boldsymbol{A}_{\rm E}^*)$ under $\boldsymbol{A}_{\rm E}^*$; (b) The ratio of $W_{\rm S}(\boldsymbol{A}_{\rm E}^*)$ and $W_{\rm E}^*$.

strict social welfare $W_{\rm S}^*$ directly; whereas, it is easy to compute the strict social welfare $W_{\rm S}(\boldsymbol{A}_{\rm E}^*)$ under the allocation $\boldsymbol{A}_{\rm E}^*$. Thus, the above observation is useful for estimating the potential welfare loss induced by the assumption of expected contract demand.

Finally, we provide numerical results to illustrate the gap of $W_{\rm E}^*$ and $W_{\rm S}(\boldsymbol{A}_{\rm E}^*)$. Numerical results in Fig. 9 show that the gap is lower than 3% when the scheduling period T is 100, and further decreases with the increasing of the scheduling period T. Take the widely-used 3G LTE (FDD) system as an example. The time length of each slot is 1 ms, and thus a scheduling period of T (slots) corresponds to a total time length of T ms. Then, the above numerical results indicate that the performance loss is no larger than 3% when scheduling spectrum every 100 ms, and is no larger than 1% when scheduling spectrum every second (i.e., $T = 1000$). These results indicate that if the spectrum regulator jointly schedules the spectrum in a relatively long time period (e.g., larger than 100 ms), the gap between the maximum expected social welfare and the maximum strict social welfare is very small (e.g., smaller than 3%).

10.3. Tightness of Welfare Ratio Bound

In this section, we analyze the tightness of our proposed welfare ratio bound. We first explain what factors affect the tightness of the welfare ratio (WR). We provide three examples to show when the bounds can be asymptotically tight. We then explain why an approximate algorithm and the WR analysis are important in this problem, although the optimal policy can be solved off-line.

We first show that the tightness of the welfare ratio (WR) in Eq. (40) depends on the performance of the adopted approximate MWIS algorithm. This is illustrated by our simulation results in Figs. 7 and 8, which show that WR is tighter with better approximate MWIS algorithms (i.e., those with higher $\bar{\epsilon}$), and looser with worse approximate MWIS algorithms (i.e., those with lower $\bar{\epsilon}$). In particular, when the adopted approximate MWIS algorithm achieves a similar performance to the

optimal MWIS algorithm (i.e., $\bar{\epsilon}$ is close to 1), we have WR $\to 1$, i.e., the welfare ratio bound is asymptotically tight.

We further show that the tightness of WR also depends on the market structure. For example, we have WR $\to \bar{\epsilon}$, if $\sum_{m=1}^{M} \mathsf{E}(w_m^s)^* >> \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left(\tau_n \mathsf{E}(w_n^c)^* + (1-\tau_n)\mathsf{E}(\widetilde{w}_n^c)^*\right)$, i.e., the potential welfare from the spot market is much larger than that from the futures market under the optimal allocation. This implies that the proposed welfare ratio bound is asymptotically tight, since $\bar{\epsilon}$ is the performance bound of the adopted approximate MWIS algorithms. On the other hand, we have $t_n \to 0$ and WR $\to \bar{\epsilon} + (1-\bar{\epsilon}) = 1$, if $\sum_{m=1}^{M} \mathsf{E}(w_m^s)^* << \sum_{n=1}^{N} \left(\tau_n \mathsf{E}(w_n^c)^* + (1-\tau_n)\mathsf{E}(\widetilde{w}_n^c)^*\right)$, i.e., the potential welfare from the futures market is much larger than that from the spot market. This also implies that the proposed welfare ratio bound is asymptotically tight.

In the above discussion, we have already provided three illustrative examples in which the proposed welfare ratio bounds are tight. In the first example, we use a close-to-optimal approximate MWIS algorithm, and achieve a WR close to 1. In the second example, we consider a market scenario with a neglectable futures market, and achieve a WR close to $\bar{\epsilon}$, where $\bar{\epsilon}$ is the performance bound of the adopted approximate MWIS algorithms. In the last example, we consider a market scenario with a neglectable spot market, and achieve a WR close to 1.

Now we explain why an approximate algorithm and the WR analysis is important in this problem. The optimal policy that maximizes the expected spectrum efficiency (in Theorem 1) can be derived in an off-line manner based on the stochastic network information. This indeed is one of the main contributions of this paper. However, the actual allocation of each spectrum in each time slot depends not only on the pre-derived optimal policy, but also on the real-time network information realization. Thus, it must be determined in an on-line manner. With spatial spectrum reuse, however, determining the optimal allocation of each spectrum (in each time slot) via a VCG auction involves solving NP-hard problems (i.e., the MWIS problems). Hence, the corresponding optimal allocation cannot be easily determined in an on-line manner due to the high complexity of solving NP-hard problems. This is the major reason why we introduce the approximate algorithms for the real-time spectrum allocation in each time slot.

10.4. Some Necessary Conditions for SIC

Before providing the problem formulation, we first present the formal definition for *allocation strategy* and study the corresponding spatial interference constraints. An allocation strategy specifies the allocation probability of any spectrum (to every SU) under any possible information realization θ.[28] More specifically,

[28] Here we omit the time index t of $\theta(t)$ for brevity, as we are not talking about a particular spectrum t.

DEFINITION 9 (ALLOCATION STRATEGY). An allocation strategy $\boldsymbol{A}(\theta)$ is a mapping from every information realization θ to a vector consisting of the allocation probability for every SU,[29]

$$\boldsymbol{A}(\theta) \triangleq (a_1^{\mathrm{s}}(\theta), ..., a_M^{\mathrm{s}}(\theta); a_1^{\mathrm{c}}(\theta), ..., a_N^{\mathrm{c}}(\theta)), \quad \forall \theta \in \boldsymbol{\Theta},$$

where $a_m^{\mathrm{s}}(\theta) \in [0,1]$ and $a_n^{\mathrm{c}}(\theta) \in [0,1]$ denote the allocation probabilities of a spectrum with information θ to spot market user m and contract user n, respectively.

Now we study the necessary and sufficient conditions for a feasible allocation strategy $\boldsymbol{A}(\theta)$, referred to as the *spatial interference constraints*.

Since the SUs in the same clique can never use the same spectrum at the same time, we have the following necessary conditions for a feasible $\boldsymbol{A}(\theta)$:

$$\textstyle\sum_{i \in Q} a_i(\theta) \leq 1, \quad \forall \theta \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}, \ \forall Q \in \mathcal{Q}(G), \tag{41}$$

where $a_i(\theta) = a_i^{\mathrm{c}}(\theta)$ if SU i is a contract user, and $a_i(\theta) = a_i^{\mathrm{s}}(\theta)$ if SU i is a spot market user.

Unfortunately, the conditions in (41) are *not* sufficient for satisfying the spatial interference constraints. This can be illustrated by a simple graph $G^{(\mathrm{a})}$ with 5 SUs forming a ring, as shown in Figure 10 (a). We can easily see that the set of all cliques in graph $G^{(\mathrm{a})}$ is $\mathcal{Q}(G^{(\mathrm{a})}) = \{\{1\},\{2\},\{3\},\{4\},\{5\},\{1,2\},\{2,3\},\{3,4\},\{4,5\},\{5,1\}\}$. Consider an allocation strategy with $a_k(\theta) = 0.5, \forall k = 1, ..., 5$. It satisfies the conditions in (41). But there is no feasible schedule to achieve this allocation, that is, it is not a feasible allocation. The same problem arises in any graph with *odd holes*, i.e., a loop formed by an odd number of edges without a chord in between. This suggests that in addition to the conditions in (41), we need to add additional constraints corresponding to the odd holes. Specifically, referring to West (2001), the constraint corresponding to an odd hole with K vertices is:

$$\textstyle\sum_{k=1}^{K} a_k(\theta) \leq \frac{K-1}{2}, \quad \forall \theta \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}. \tag{42}$$

Due to space limitations, we do not present the detailed proof here. Recall the example in Figure 10 (a), an allocation strategy with $a_k(\theta) = 0.4, \forall k = 1, ..., 5$ is feasible since $\sum_{k=1}^{K} a_k(\theta) \leq 2$, and we can achieve such an allocation by the following schedule: scheduling/assigning the spectrums (with information θ) to the user sets {1,3}, {1,4}, {2,4}, {2,5} and {3,5} with equal fraction (probability), i.e., 20%. Obviously, each user achieves an allocation probability of 40%.

The worse thing is that even if we consider the constraints in (42) imposed by the odd holes in addition to those in (41) imposed by the cliques, we are *not* guaranteed to have a feasible allocation. This can be further illustrated by the example shown in Figure 10 (b). We can see that there are 3 types of cliques in the graph $G^{(\mathrm{b})}$: the cliques formed by each SU (e.g., {1}), the cliques formed by

[29] Note that we use the same notation $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$ to denote the information space, i.e., the set of all possible θ.



Figure 10 An illustration of graphs with odd holes.

the adjacent pairs of SUs (e.g., {1,2}), and the cliques formed by the 3 SUs in the same triangles (e.g., {1,2,6}). We can also see there are five 3-SUs odd holes each corresponding to one triangle and one 5-SUs odd hole $\{1,2,3,4,5\}$. Consider an allocation strategy with $a_k(\theta)=\frac{1}{3}, \forall k=1,...,6$. Obviously, it satisfies the conditions in (41) and (42). But there is no feasible schedule to achieve this allocation.

10.5. Optimal Solution with Hard Contracts

Similar to Lemma 1 and Lemma 2 in Section 5.2, we have the following necessary condition for hard contracts.

COROLLARY 1 **(Necessary Condition)**. *For any contract user n with the hard contract, we have:* $\mathbb{E}[d_n]=0$ *or* D_n.

Corollary 1 states that a hard contract user either gets spectrums (on average) equals to his demand, or nothing. The reason is that once a hard contract is violated, the welfare loss is a constant $\widehat{B}_n$ regardless of the actual number of spectrums the contract user n obtains.

According to Corollary 1, a hard contract is either fully satisfied, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[d_n]=D_n$, or fully violated, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[d_n]=0$. Thus, for a future market with N hard contracts, there are 2^N possible outcomes based on the state (satisfied or violated) of each contract. Each outcome corresponds to a potential best solution, and the global optimal solution is the one that achieves the highest profit within the 2^N potential best solutions.

Consider a particular outcome where a subset of hard contracts $\mathcal{N}^+$ are satisfied and others are violated, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[d_n]=D_n, \forall n\in\mathcal{N}^+$ and $\mathbb{E}[d_n]=0, \forall n\notin\mathcal{N}^+$. Obviously, we have $a_n(\theta)\equiv 0, \forall\theta\in\mathbf{\Theta}$ for all contract users $n\notin\mathcal{N}^+$, and thus we can ignore these contracts directly. For the reduced market (by removing those contract users not in $\mathcal{N}^+$), the PO's objective function in (26) can be

rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{A}_0^*(\theta) = \arg\max_{\boldsymbol{A}_0(\theta)} \ & \left(F + S \cdot \textstyle\sum_{k=1}^K \int_\theta H_k(\theta) a_k(\theta) f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta) \mathrm{d}\theta\right), \\ s.t. \quad \text{(i)} \quad & a_k(\theta) \geq 0, \ \forall k = 1, ..., K, \forall \theta \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}; \\ \text{(ii)} \quad & \textstyle\sum_{k=1}^K a_k(\theta) \leq 1, \ \forall \theta \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}; \\ \text{(iii)} \quad & \mathbb{E}[d_n] = D_n, \ \forall n \in \mathcal{N}^+; \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

Note that the notations in (43) are defined in a same way as those in (26).

Compare the objective function (43) for hard contracts to (26) for soft contracts, we can find that both objective functions have the same structure *except* for the third constraint. Specifically, in (26) the third constraint is an *inequality* constraint, while in (43) the third constraint is an *equality* constraint. To solve (43), we similarly introduce Lagrange multipliers $\mu_k(\theta)$ for constraint (i), $\eta(\theta)$ for constraint (ii) and λ_n for constraint (iii). The dual constraints for $\mu_n(\theta)$ and $\eta(\theta)$ are same as those for (26), while the dual constraint for λ_n becomes:

$$\text{(D.3)} \quad D_n = \mathbb{E}[d_n], \text{ and } \lambda_n^* \cdot \big(D_n - \mathbb{E}[d_n]\big) = 0, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N}^+.$$

By the Euler-Lagrange conditions for optimality and duality principle, we can derive the best solution for (43) in a similar way to compute the optimal solution for (26). Specifically, the feasible ranges of $\mu_k^*(\theta)$ and $\eta^*(\theta)$ are totally same as those for soft contracts given by Lemmas 3 and 4. By the dual constraint for λ_n mentioned above, the optimal λ_n^* is a bit different to that for soft contracts given by Lemma 6:

$$\lambda_n^* = \left(\arg_{\lambda_n} S \textstyle\int_{\theta \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}_n^+(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{-n}^*, \lambda_n)} f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta) \mathrm{d}\theta = D_n\right), \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N}.$$

That is, for hard contracts, we do not need to restrict the shadow price λ_n to be non-negative. Given the optimal shadow prices, the optimal solution can be characterized by Lemma 5.

10.6. Proof for Proposition 1

Proof. A feasible allocation must be achievable in practice by a feasible schedule. A schedule essentially specifies the fraction of spectrums (with certain information θ) to a particular set of independent SUs. Define the fraction of spectrums to a particular independent SUs set as the allocation probability to this independent set.

A feasible schedule implies that the total fraction of spectrums (with information θ) to all independent SU sets does not exceed 100%, which is exactly equivalent to the condition in (13). That is, for any feasible allocation or schedule, there is always an allocation strategy $\boldsymbol{A}(\theta)$ (with respect to the independent SU set) satisfying (13) and achieving the same allocation.

10.7. Proof for Proposition 2

Proof. We prove the proposition by contradiction. Suppose $a_k^{\text{Ind}*}(\theta) > 0$ for certain independent set $I_k = I_k^{\text{c}} \bigcup I_k^{\text{s}}$, where I_k^{s} is not an MWIS of the side market $G_{I_k^{\text{c}}}^{\text{s}}$. Then the PO can improve his expected profit by transferring the spectrums for independent set $I_k = I_k^{\text{c}} \bigcup I_k^{\text{s}}$ to another independent set $\{I_k^{\text{c}}, I_k^{\text{s}*}\}$, where $I_k^{\text{s}*}$ is indeed an MWIS of the side market $G_{I_k^{\text{c}}}^{\text{s}}$. The reason is that the PO can achieve a higher revenue from the spot market user $I_k^{\text{s}*}$ than that from set I_k^{s}, while the revenue from the contract user set I_k^{c} does not change (since the allocation to contract users remains the same). It follows that the $a_k^{\text{Ind}*}(\theta)$ must be zero.

10.8. Proof for Lemma 1

Proof. We prove the lemma by contradiction. Suppose there exists any θ such that $\sum_{k=0}^{K} a_k^*(\theta) < 1$. Obviously, by increasing $a_0^*(\theta)$ to $a_0^+(\theta) = 1 - \sum_{k=1}^{K} a_k^*(\theta)$, the PO can improve the expected revenue $\mathbb{E}[Z_0]$ from the spot market (which is given in (22)) without affecting the revenue and cost from the contract users. This implies the PO can achieve a higher expected profit with a new strategy $\boldsymbol{A}^+(\theta) = \big(a_0^+(\theta), a_1^*(\theta), ..., a_K^*(\theta)\big)$.

10.9. Proof for Lemma 2

Proof. We prove the lemma by contradiction. Suppose there exists a contract user n with $\mathbb{E}[d_n] = S \cdot \int_\theta a_n(\theta) \cdot f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta) \mathrm{d}\theta > D_n$, where $a_n(\theta) = \sum_{k=0}^{K} l_k^n \cdot a_k(\theta)$. Let $\mathcal{K}_n$ denote the set of independent sets containing contract user n, i.e., $l_k^n = 1, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}_n$. Let $\mathcal{K}_{n/\{n\}}$ denote the set of independent sets each corresponding to one element in $\mathcal{K}_n$ by removing contract user n.[30]

Let $\boldsymbol{A}^+(\theta) = \big(a_0^+(\theta), a_1^+(\theta), ..., a_K^+(\theta)\big)$ denote a new allocation strategy, by transferring certain spectrum for each independent set in $\mathcal{K}_n$ to the corresponding set in $\mathcal{K}_{n/\{n\}}$, i.e., (i) $a_k^+(\theta) = a_k^*(\theta) - \sigma, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}_n$, and $a_k^+(\theta) = a_k^*(\theta) + \sigma, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}_{n/\{n\}}$, and (ii) $a_k^+(\theta) = a_k^*(\theta), \forall k \notin \mathcal{K}_n \bigcup \mathcal{K}_{n/\{n\}}$. It is easy to see that with $\boldsymbol{A}^+(\theta)$, the allocation probability to contract user n decreases to $a_n^+(\theta) = a_n(\theta) - \sigma \cdot |\mathcal{K}_n|$, and thus the expected number of spectrums for contract user n decreases to $\mathbb{E}[d_n^+] = \mathbb{E}[d_n] - \sigma \cdot S \cdot |\mathcal{K}_n|$. As long as $0 < \sigma \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[d_n] - D_n}{S \cdot |\mathcal{K}_n|}$, we have $\mathbb{E}[d_n^+] = \mathbb{E}[d_n] - \sigma \cdot S \cdot |\mathcal{K}_n| \geq D_n$, i.e., the contract n is still fulfilled. This implies that the PO suffers no short-term revenue loss from contract user n. Besides, the allocation probabilities to all other contract users remain the same, and thus the PO suffers no short-term revenue loss from other contract users. On the other hand, the PO can achieve a higher expected side revenue from the side markets of the independent sets in $\mathcal{K}_{n/\{n\}}$ than those in $\mathcal{K}_n$. It follows that the PO can achieve higher expected profit with new strategy $\boldsymbol{A}^+(\theta)$.

[30] For example, in Figure 1, we have $\mathcal{K}_1 = \{\{1\}, \{1,4\}\}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{1/\{1\}} = \{\emptyset, \{4\}\}$ for contract user 1, and $\mathcal{K}_4 = \{\{4\}, \{1,4\}, \{2,4\}\}$ and $\mathcal{K}_{4/\{4\}} = \{\emptyset, \{1\}, \{2\}\}$ for contract user 4.

10.10. Proof for Corollary 1

Proof. By Lemma 2, we have $\mathbb{E}[d_n] \leq D_n, \forall n \in \mathcal{N}$. Thus, we only need to show that there is no contract user n with $0 < \mathbb{E}[d_n] < D_n$. We prove the corollary by contradiction. Suppose there exists a contract user n with $0 < \mathbb{E}[d_n] < D_n$. According to the definitions of hard contract, the expected revenue achieved from contract user n is $\mathbb{E}[R_n] = B_n - \widehat{B}_n$. Let us define $\mathcal{K}_n$ and $\mathcal{K}_{n/\{n\}}$ in a same way as those in Appendix-10.9.

Let $\boldsymbol{A}^+(\theta) = \big(a_0^+(\theta), a_1^+(\theta), ..., a_K^+(\theta)\big)$ denote a new allocation strategy, by transferring all spectrums for each independent set in $\mathcal{K}_n$ to the corresponding set in $\mathcal{K}_{n/\{n\}}$, i.e., (i) $a_k^+(\theta) = 0, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}_n$, and $a_k^+(\theta) = a_k^*(\theta) + a_{k'}^*(\theta), \forall k \in \mathcal{K}_{n/\{n\}}$, where k' is the corresponding independent set in $\mathcal{K}_n$, and (ii) $a_k^+(\theta) = a_k^*(\theta), \forall k \notin \mathcal{K}_n \bigcup \mathcal{K}_{n/\{n\}}$. It is easy to see that with $\boldsymbol{A}^+(\theta)$, the allocation probability to contract user n decreases to $a_n^+(\theta) = 0$, while the probabilities to all other contract users remain the same. Obviously, the PO achieves the same expected revenue from all contract users. On the other hand, the PO can achieve a higher expected side revenue from the side markets of the independent sets in $\mathcal{K}_{n/\{n\}}$ than those in $\mathcal{K}_n$. Thus, the PO can achieve higher expected profit with new strategy $\boldsymbol{A}^+(\theta)$.

10.11. Proof for Lemma 3

Proof. We prove the lemma by *duality principle* in particular the dual constraint (D.1), i.e., $\mu_k^*(\theta) \geq 0$, $a_k^*(\theta) \geq 0$ and $\mu_k^*(\theta) \cdot a_k^*(\theta) = 0, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \theta \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}$. According to the Definitions 6 and 7, we have: $\mathcal{L}^{(k)}(\theta) = \mathcal{J}_1^{(k)}(\theta) + \mu_k^*(\theta), \forall k$.

Proof for Condition (a). Suppose $\mu_k^*(\theta) > 0$ by contradiction. Then we have: $\mathcal{L}^{(k)}(\theta) = \mathcal{J}_1^{(k)}(\theta) + \mu_k^*(\theta) > 0$, which implies $a_k^*(\theta) = 1$ by the Euler-Lagrange conditions for optimality or (28). Obviously, this violates the constraint $\mu_n^*(\theta) \cdot a_n^*(\theta) = 0$.

Proof for Condition (b). Suppose $\mu_k^*(\theta) > |\mathcal{J}_1^{(k)}(\theta)| > 0$ by contradiction. Then we have: $\mathcal{L}^{(k)}(\theta) = \mathcal{J}_1^{(k)}(\theta) + \mu_k^*(\theta) > 0$, which implies $a_k^*(\theta) = 1$. Obviously, this violates the constraint $\mu_k^*(\theta) \cdot a_k^*(\theta) = 0$. Thus, we have: $\mu_k^*(\theta) \in [0,\ |\mathcal{J}_1^{(k)}(\theta)|]$, since $\mu_k^*(\theta) \geq 0$.

10.12. Proof for Lemma 4

Proof. We prove the lemma by *duality principle* in particular the dual constraint (D.2), i.e., $\eta^*(\theta) \geq 0$, $\sum_{k=1}^K a_k^*(\theta) \leq 1$ and $\eta^*(\theta) \cdot \big(1 - \sum_{k=1}^K a_k^*(\theta)\big) = 0, \forall \theta \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}$. According to the Definitions 7 and 8, we have: $\mathcal{J}_1^{(k)}(\theta) = \mathcal{J}_2^{(k)}(\theta) - \eta^*(\theta)$, $\forall k$.

Proof for Condition (a). We first prove that $\eta^*(\theta) \leq K_1(\theta) \triangleq \max_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \mathcal{J}_2^{(k)}(\theta)$. Suppose $\eta^*(\theta) > K_1(\theta)$ by contradiction. Then we have: $\mathcal{J}_1^{(k)}(\theta) = \mathcal{J}_2^{(k)}(\theta) - \eta^*(\theta) < 0, \forall k$. Together with Lemma 3, we further have: $\mathcal{L}^{(k)}(\theta) < 0, \forall k$, and thus $a_k^*(\theta) = 0, \forall k$, which implies $\sum_{k=1}^K a_k^*(\theta) = 0$. Obviously, this violates the constraint $\eta^*(\theta) \cdot (1 - \sum_{k=1}^K a_k^*(\theta)) = 0$.

We then prove that $\eta^*(\theta) \geq \max(0, K_2(\theta))$. The result is obvious if $K_2(\theta) \leq 0$ since $\eta^*(\theta) \geq 0$. Thus, we focus on the case of $K_2(\theta) > 0$, where there exist at least two independent sets with positive core marginal profit $\mathcal{J}_2^{(k)}(\theta)$. Let k_1 and k_2 denote the independent sets with the highest and second-highest core marginal profits, respectively. That is, $\mathcal{J}_2^{(k_1)}(\theta) = K_1(\theta) > 0$ and $\mathcal{J}_2^{(k_2)}(\theta) = K_2(\theta) > 0$. Suppose $\eta^*(\theta) < K_2(\theta)$ by contradiction. Then there exist at least two independent sets, i.e., k_1 and k_2, with positive mental marginal profit, i.e., $\mathcal{J}_1^{(k_1)}(\theta) > 0$ and $\mathcal{J}_1^{(k_2)}(\theta) > 0$. Together with Lemma 3, we further have: $\mathcal{L}^{(k_1)}(\theta) > 0$ and $\mathcal{L}^{(k_2)}(\theta) > 0$, and thus $a_{k_1}^*(\theta) = 1$ and $a_{k_2}^*(\theta) = 1$, which implies $\sum_{k=1}^K a_k^*(\theta) > 1$. This obviously violates the constraint $\sum_{k=1}^K a_k^*(\theta) \leq 1$.

Proof for Condition (b). Suppose $\eta^*(\theta) > 0$ by contradiction. Then we have: $\mathcal{J}_1^{(k)}(\theta) = \mathcal{J}_2^{(k)}(\theta) - \eta^*(\theta) < 0, \forall k$. Together with Lemma 3, we further have: $\mathcal{L}^{(k)}(\theta) < 0, \forall k$, and thus $a_k^*(\theta) = 0, \forall k$, which implies $\sum_{k=1}^K a_k^*(\theta) = 0$. Obviously, this violates the constraint $\eta^*(\theta) \cdot (1 - \sum_{k=1}^K a_k^*(\theta)) = 0$.

10.13. Proof for Lemma 5

Proof. We prove the lemma by the Euler-Lagrange conditions for optimality, i.e., (28).

We first prove $a_k^*(\theta) = 0$ for all independent sets $k \notin \boldsymbol{k}^*$. By contradiction, we suppose there exists an independent set $k_0 \notin \boldsymbol{k}^*$ with $a_{k_0}^*(\theta) > 0$. According to (28), we have: $\mathcal{L}^{(k_0)}(\theta) \geq 0$. By Lemmas 3 and 4, we further have: $\mathcal{J}_2^{(k_0)}(\theta) \geq 0$. Further, according to the definition of $\boldsymbol{k}^*$, we have: $\mathcal{J}_2^{(k_0)}(\theta) < K_1(\theta)$, since $k_0 \notin \boldsymbol{k}^*$. This implies $\mathcal{J}_2^{(k)}(\theta) = K_1(\theta) > 0, \forall k \in \boldsymbol{k}^*$. By Lemmas 3 and 4, we further have: $\mathcal{L}^{(k)}(\theta) > 0$, and thus $a_k^*(\theta) = 1, \forall k \in \boldsymbol{k}^*$, which implies that $\sum_{k=1}^K a_k^*(\theta) = a_{k_0}^*(\theta) + \sum_{k \in \boldsymbol{k}^*} a_k^*(\theta) + \sum_{k \notin \boldsymbol{k}^* \cup \{k_0\}} a_k^*(\theta) > 1$. This obviously violates the constraint $\sum_{k=1}^K a_k^*(\theta) \leq 1$.

We then prove the optimal solution for $k \in \boldsymbol{k}^*$. Obviously, $\mathcal{J}_2^{(k)}(\theta) = K_1(\theta), \forall k \in \boldsymbol{k}^*$.

Proof for case (a). By Lemma 4, we have: $\eta^*(\theta) \leq K_1(\theta)$ if $K_1(\theta) > 0$, which implies $\mathcal{J}_1^{(k)}(\theta) = \mathcal{J}_2^{(k)}(\theta) - \eta^*(\theta) = K_1(\theta) - \eta^*(\theta) \geq 0$, $\forall k \in \boldsymbol{k}^*$. By Lemma 3, we further have: $\mu_k^*(\theta) = 0$ if $\mathcal{J}_1^{(k)}(\theta) \geq 0$, which further implies $\mathcal{L}^{(k)}(\theta) = \mathcal{J}_1^{(k)}(\theta) - 0 \geq 0$, $\forall k \in \boldsymbol{k}^*$.

Case (a.1). Suppose $\eta^*(\theta) = K_1(\theta) > 0$. By constraint $\eta^*(\theta) \cdot (1 - \sum_{k=1}^K a_k^*(\theta)) = 0$, we have: $\sum_{k=1}^K a_k^*(\theta) = 1$, which implies $\sum_{k \in \boldsymbol{k}^*} a_k^*(\theta) = 1$, since $a_k^*(\theta) = 0$, $\forall k \notin \boldsymbol{k}^*$.

Case (a.2). Suppose $\eta^*(\theta) < K_1(\theta)$. Then we must have: $K_2(\theta) < K_1(\theta)$, otherwise $\eta^*(\theta)$ must equal to $K_1(\theta)$ since $\eta^*(\theta) \in [\max(0, K_2(\theta)), K_1(\theta)]$. This implies that there is only one independent set, denoted by k_1, in the set $\boldsymbol{k}^*$. Obviously, $\mathcal{L}^{(k_1)}(\theta) = K_1(\theta) - \eta^*(\theta) > 0$. According to (28), we have: $a_{k_1}^*(\theta) = 1$, which implies $\sum_{k \in \boldsymbol{k}^*} a_k^*(\theta) = 1$, since $\boldsymbol{k}^* = \{k_1\}$.

Proof for case (b). By Lemma 4, we have: $\eta^*(\theta) = 0$ if $K_1(\theta) = 0$, which implies $\mathcal{J}_1^{(k)}(\theta) = \mathcal{J}_2^{(k)}(\theta) - 0 = K_1(\theta) = 0$, $\forall k \in \boldsymbol{k}^*$. By Lemma 3, we further have: $\mu_k^*(\theta) = 0$ if $\mathcal{J}_1^{(k)}(\theta) = 0$, which further implies $\mathcal{L}^{(k)}(\theta) = \mathcal{J}_1^{(k)}(\theta) - 0 = 0$, $\forall k \in \boldsymbol{k}^*$. According to the dual constraint (D.2), we have: $\sum_{k \in \boldsymbol{k}^*} a_k^*(\theta) \leq 1$.

Proof for case (c). By Lemma 4, we have: $\eta^*(\theta)=0$ if $K_1(\theta)<0$, which implies $\mathcal{J}_1^{(k)}(\theta)=\mathcal{J}_2^{(k)}(\theta)-0=K_1(\theta)<0$, $\forall k\in\boldsymbol{k}^*$. By Lemma 3, we further have: $\mu_k^*(\theta)\le|\mathcal{J}_1^{(k)}(\theta)|$ if $\mathcal{J}_1^{(k)}(\theta)<0$, which further implies $\mathcal{L}^{(k)}(\theta)=\mathcal{J}_1^{(k)}(\theta)+\mu_k^*(\theta)=K_1(\theta)+\mu_k^*(\theta)\le 0$, $\forall k\in\boldsymbol{k}^*$.

Case (c.1). Suppose $\mu_k^*(\theta)=|\mathcal{J}_1^{(k)}(\theta)|>0$. By constraint $\mu_k^*(\theta)\cdot a_k^*(\theta)=0$, we have: $a_k^*(\theta)=0$, $\forall k\in\boldsymbol{k}^*$.

Case (c.2). Suppose $\mu_k^*(\theta)<|\mathcal{J}_1^{(k)}(\theta)|$. Then we have: $\mathcal{L}^{(k)}(\theta)<0$, $\forall k\in\boldsymbol{k}^*$. According to (28), we have: $a_k^*(\theta)=0$, $\forall k\in\boldsymbol{k}^*$.

10.14. Proof for Lemma 6

Proof. We first note that $\mathbb{E}[d_n]\triangleq S\int_{\theta\in\boldsymbol{\Theta}_n^+(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^*)}f_{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}(\theta)\mathrm{d}\theta$ decreases with the contract user n's own shadow price λ_n, while increases with other contract users' shadow prices $\lambda_{n'},\forall n'\neq n$. For convenience, we write $\mathbb{E}[d_n]$ as a function of λ_n, denoted by $\mathbb{E}[d_n(\lambda_n)]$.[31] Let λ_n^o denote the shadow price λ_n such that $\mathbb{E}[d_n(\lambda_n)]=D_n$, i.e., $\lambda_n^o\triangleq\arg_{\lambda_n}(\mathbb{E}[d_n(\lambda_n)]=D_n)$. Thus, we can rewrite the optimal shadow price λ_n^* in Lemma 6 as $\lambda_n^*=\max\{0,\lambda_n^o\},\forall n$. We prove the lemma by *duality principle* in particular the dual constraint (D.3), i.e., $\lambda_n^*\ge 0$, $D_n-\mathbb{E}[d_n(\lambda_n^*)]\ge 0$ and $\lambda_n^*\cdot\big(D_n-\mathbb{E}[d_n(\lambda_n^*)]\big)=0$, $\forall n\in\mathcal{N}$.

Consider the first case: $\mathbb{E}[d_n(0)]\le D_n$. It is easy to see that $\lambda_n^o<0$, since $\mathbb{E}[d_n(\lambda_n)]$ decreases with λ_n. Thus, we only need to prove $\lambda_n^*=\max\{0,\lambda_n^o\}=0$. Suppose $\lambda_n^*>0$ by contradiction. Then we have: $\mathbb{E}[d_n(\lambda_n^*)]<\mathbb{E}[d_n(0)]\le D_n$. This obviously violates the constraint $\lambda_n^*\cdot\big(D_n-\mathbb{E}[d_n(\lambda_n^*)]\big)=0$.

Consider the second case: $\mathbb{E}[d_n(0)]>D_n$. It is easy to see that $\lambda_n^o>0$. Thus, we only need to prove $\lambda_n^*=\{0,\lambda_n^o\}=\lambda_n^o>0$. Suppose $\lambda_n^*>\lambda_n^o$ by contradiction. Then we have: $\mathbb{E}[d_n(\lambda_n^*)]<\mathbb{E}[d_n(\lambda_n^o)]=D_n$. This obviously violates the constraint $\lambda_n^*\cdot\big(D_n-\mathbb{E}[d_n(\lambda_n^*)]\big)=0$. Suppose $\lambda_n^*<\lambda_n^o$ by contradiction. Then we have: $\mathbb{E}[d_n(\lambda_n^*)]>\mathbb{E}[d_n(\lambda_n^o)]=D_n$. This obviously violates the constraint $\mathbb{E}[d_n(\lambda_n^*)]\le D_n$.

[31] Note that $\mathbb{E}[d_n(\lambda_n)]$ also depends on the shadow prices $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{-n}$ of other contract users.